

3. A
LETTER
TO A
Gentleman in *Edinburgh*,
CONTAINING
REMARKS
UPON A
LATE APOLOGY
FOR THE

Presbyterians in Scotland,
Who keep COMMUNION in the OR-
DINANCES of the GOSPEL with
Mr. GEORGE WHITEFIELD,
a PRIEST of the *Church of England*.

SHEWING,

That such a Practice is not justifiable by the Prin-
ciples and Practice of the Church of *Scotland*,
from the Reformation to this Day, nor by the
Westminster Confession of Faith, *Solemn League*
and Covenant.

By *John Bisset*
IN WHICH,

Mr. WHITEFIELD's Religion, Orthodoxy, and moral
Character, are set in a proper Light, by Collections
from his own printed Performances.

The Second EDITION Corrected.

G L A S G O W:

Printed for JOHN NEWLANDS, Merchant in *Glasgow*,
MDCCXLIII.

a
T
f
m
M
T
a
t
b
C
ti

l
W
p
ft
ri
p
p
w
fi
w
t

A
LETTER, &c.

S I R,

I Am greatly obliged to you, for your Care in sending me such Pamphlets as come out now and then, relative to Matters in Agitation among you; I incline not you should be at the Charge of them; but, since you have been so kind, tho' I am not fond to write Missives concerning these Things, you lay me under Obligations a little to answer your Demands. At this Time, I shall, and must confine myself to the Apology for the Hearers of Mr. *Whitefield*. It were not, in my Opinion, a difficult Task to answer it to some good Purpose, and to detect all the Author's Mistakes; but this I am not to pretend to do; I wish it were done by them who have more Ability and Leisure than I have: But, as a thankful Gratification to you, I shall offer to your Consideration some Remarks upon it.

I expected the Author would have extended his Apology for the Employers, as well as the Hearers of Mr. *Whitefield*; and I think they should have been first apologized for; but he hath either left that to be understood, or found it more difficult to vindicate Presbyterian Ministers, who have written for, and employed a profess'd Priest of the Church of *England*, than to apologize for the People that have been Hearers of him, whom their Ministers employed. It was perhaps difficult to defend those Presbyterian Ministers and Elders, who, in Judicatures, and elsewhere, have been among the loudest Complainers, because of the decline of Pres-

bytery in our Land, yet have invited Mr. *Whitefield*, who preaches an Indifferency about the Government of Christ's House: Perhaps they have changed their Principles, and seen the Folly of their former Zeal; which, if it be, I wish the Apologist had told so much, and then we had known that we had to do with Men of other Principles than our old Friends once were. I wish these Gentlemen had changed their Principles sooner, and had not of late Years troubled the Country with their Missives of the Church's being in Danger, when some Things before the National Assemblies were decided and enacted in a Way hurtful to our Presbyterian Government. Others, whom they looked upon as the lax, Latitudinarian Party, acted a more consistent Part, than they, who, after all their pretended Struggles to the contrary, have fairly confessed narrow Views; and therefore invited the strolling Priest to cure them. I refer for this, to the Letter inviting Mr. *Whitefield* first to *Scotland*, annexed to the Friendly Caution to the Seceders. The Inviters of this Gentleman could not be Strangers to Mr. *Whitefield's* Latitudinarian Principles; and therefore it may be modestly questioned, if one of such Principles was a fit Physician for Men of a narrow Way of thinking. If a Physician cannot cure me of a Disease, without infecting me with another more, at least equally, dangerous, I should not thank them who had provided me with such a Physician. How far Mr. *Whitefield* hath the Art of a Quack, instead of a skilful Physician, any versed in his Measures, that thought it worth their Pains, might shew, without much Labour, I had almost said, Knowledge and Learning; but this I think his Votaries will not be so brisk as to threep upon him.

I am heartily sorry for the narrow Way of thinking, and unaccountable Way of doing, that is with some of the worthy Ministers of the Secession, who forbid Communion with such Ministers as are not one Whit behind themselves, in witnessing against prevailing Evils, and the Defections of the Church of *Scotland*; but I never expected that some Ministers and Elders, because

of

of their Extremes, would have given up with all their former Contendings, and have invited, imployed, and cared for, a Subverter of our Government, as it would seem, for this End, to break the Seceders. But let the Seceders thank themselves, who were the first Invited, and Employers of Mr. *Whitefield*, and whose Conduct with respect to him offends, I think, as true Presbyterians as themselves, in that it is some Years since they were warned to beware of him. I do not, as others, complain of their making it a Reason of Mourning, that an *English* Priest gets such Countenance among Presbyterians; but I am offended, to Indignation, at their Manner of laying down that Reason, charging the Guilt on others, and for Reasons, of which they themselves were as well apprised, when they did set up so fondly for him. It had become them well, and would have been satisfying to many, that they had humbly and honestly charged this Guilt upon themselves; for, it is Fact, they were the *first* guilty Persons, and the *most* guilty; but, to charge the Fault on others, and for Reasons that could not be hid from them, and to take no more of the Fault to themselves, but that, "When we conversed with him, he did not answer our Expectation," is such a bare-fac'd Truckling, that on their Account, I both tremble at it, and am ashamed of it. But I must break off from this, lest I forget the Design of this Missive, tho' this is not from the Purpose, it being a Matter so inconsistent with the Extremity of their Secession, separating from Ministers, witnessing against the Defections and Corruptions of this Church, and against the great Wrong and Iniquity done to them also, when they are carefing, and corresponding with Mr. *Whitefield*, of whom they could not but know, that at the Time he pretends to preach against the doctrinal Corruptions of the Church of *England*, he forbids a Separation from it, and upon the Matter excommunicates them who do so, esteeming no more of Scruples about their Worship and Government, than of a Controversy about *Meats* and *Drinks*.

It will be remembered likewise, that there was common

mon Access to read the *Account of God's Dealings with his Soul* before a Reverend Minister of the Associate Presbytery spoke so highly of him in his Pulpit, (I do not mean the Baggage lately utter'd in a News-Paper,) which Expressions were utter'd by him, after he had heard Mr. *Whitefield*, which hath made some think, that such a Speech tended as much to commend himself as Mr. *Whitefield*; and yet, after all this, in the Reasons of their Fast, not to deal candidly! This, with their Conduct to Ministers, who are before-hand with them in witnessing against Corrupters; I say against Corrupters, at the Time they were carressing a most sly Corrupter, hath brought on them a Blot that will not be easily wiped off.

But however much these good Men have mistaken their Measures, in their countenancing Mr. *Whitefield*, (whom they now reject, and should justly have done so sooner) when yet they are carrying their Secession from some Ministers (not inferior to them in their Contendings for run-down Presbytery,) to an Extremity; this was no Warrant for our old profess'd Strugglers against corrupt Measures, to run to another Extreme, when they saw the evil of Extremes on one Hand, it might have been to them a Caveat against Extremes on the other. I know no other Meaning that their inviting Mr. *Whitefield* to *Scotland*, to reclaim some from narrow Ways of thinking hath, unless it be, "Make Haste, Dear Mr. *Whitefield*, in coming to *Scotland*;" "we look on you as a fit Instrument to break the Seceders, or that now some Kind of Independency is spreading in *Scotland*;" and we want to let the World see that we are not offended at them, when we can go the Length to invite a Creature of the Supremacy to come and labour among us; or, we incline no longer to be contending for the Discipline and Government of this Church of *Scotland*: "Therefore make Haste hither to reclaim us from our narrow Ways of thinking, and unhappy Debates about what you esteem no otherwise than a contending about Meats and Drinks."

What

What can be the Inviters Meaning about our narrow Ways of thinking? It must certainly have a Reference to one or other of the Things in Debate among us. They will not allow that their Ways of thinking about the Principles of our common Hope, are peevish and narrow; and therefore I suppose, they want not to be reclaimed from these. There are many Debates among us about the Purity of the Worship, since by the Toleration, the Service of the Church of *England* hath prevailed so much; shall I think, they invited Mr. *Whitefield* to *Scotland* to smoothen us into an Indifferency about that? I am unwilling to think that is their Meaning. It must remain, therefore, that they invite him to *Scotland* to reclaim us from narrow Ways of thinking about the Government of the Church. Shall we not say that Ministers and Judicatories for some Years have been carrying on a Course of Defection, corrupting the Ministry, and subverting our Presbyterian Government, but an *English* Priest must be called in to reclaim us from this narrow Way of thinking? Shall we not give up with Judicatures and Ministers who are corrupting and subverting our ecclesiastical Government, by taking out a new Right from the Magistrate to sit in Judicatures, but a Priest of *England* must be called in to reclaim us from these narrow Ways of thinking, by teaching us to hold Communion with all professing the Christian Name of every Denomination; or, to use his own adopted Words in his applauded Extract, *With every Division of Christians?*

I shall somewhat excuse the Apologist, for pothering so much with the Practice of Presbyterians, in the different Periods of Episcopacy's obtaining in this Land, that almost every profess'd Presbyterian makes more ado with that, than they should. I wish all of us would look more to the Rule of God's Word, than to the Practice of sinful Men, except in so far as their Practice hath been agreeable to that unerring Rule. If we would take this Way more; we would, at least, clear our Debates of Arguments taken from historical Narratives,

ratives, containing but very perplexed Accounts of the State of Things in those Periods to which they refer.

There are a few Scriptures, if studied, and well understood, might be of great Use to direct our Conduct towards Ministers of another Denomination than what is Presbyterian. *Matth.* xxviii. 19, 20. *Matth.* v. 18. 19. *Joh.* xiv. 21. *Acts* ii. 42. *Rom.* xvi. 17 18. *1 Cor.* i. 10. *Gal.* ii. 11. &c. *1 Cor.* ii. 2. 2 *Thes.* ii. throughout. And iii. 6. and downward. *1 Tim.* iv. 1, 2. *Tit.* iii. 10. *1 John* iv. 1. to the 7th Verse. 2 *Joh.* 10. and 11 Verses. *Matth.* xxiv. 23. to 28. *Rev.* 2d and 3d Chapters,-----and many other Places that might be mentioned. I take it for granted, I am dealing with Presbyterians, with them who believe our Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government, in their uncorrupted Form, to be agreeable to the Word of God; so that upon these Scriptures, I say, that I ought to withdraw from them who hold not the Truth according to these Scriptures; and if Mr. *Whitefield's* Votaries can clear him as not guilty in all, or one or other of these Respects, they will say more for justifying the hearing and employing of him, than all they can alledge from the Practice of *Scotch* Presbyterians in any Periods since our Reformation from Popery. For truly in trying and difficult Times, very often the best of Men have been straitned what Part to act, and often have acted such a Part, that if they had seen or suspected the Consequences, they would not have acted. And as to the Conduct of Presbyterians in the first Episcopal Period, that seems not so cleared up by any History that I have seen, as Need will require.

I shall offer now a few Remarks, following the Apologist in the Method he lays down; which is first to shew the State and Circumstances of our Church under the Episcopacy introduced upon the Restoration, where he enumerates sundry Acts and Deeds well enough known to any who enquire into these Things. He observes that the Usurpation of the State upon the Church, the rude Measures then taken, the Injustice done, in thrusting

thrusting in immoral and insufficient Men of the Episcopal Way, made the People refuse to hear them, and to suffer the greatest Hardships for their Recusancy. But, Pag. 9th, tho' he allows some Advantage arising from this Refusal, he speaks suspiciously, as from the Opinion of some at this Day, if the not hearing the Curates was sufficient to found such Sufferings upon. Now, apply this to the hearing of Mr. *Whitefield*; if the not hearing of him may keep up a Testimony against Episcopacy; were it not good to forbear countenancing him, when, he being supposed sound in Doctrine, and regular in his Life, People are in Hazard of being brought to a Liking to the Episcopacy he holds fast? If any shall say, "There is no Hazard " this Way:" The Apologist furnishes me with an Answer, Pag. 8th, "Several of the Curates being sound " in their Doctrine, and regular in their Lives, not " only reconciled their Parishes to hear them, but also " in Time brought them to a Liking to Episcopacy itself." Now, I ask, setting aside all other Considerations, if my hearing a sound and regular Episcopalian, shall bring me to a Liking to Episcopacy itself; (as is now too much the Case with many of Mr. *Whitefield's* Hearers, who, not to say more, are much softened in their Opposition to Episcopacy,) ought I to employ, hear or countenance such an one, who goes about softening us into an Indifferency about Episcopacy, or who so steadfastly adheres to it? If I do so, I shall bring myself and others insensibly in to a Liking to Episcopacy itself. The Apologist shews that, "If the Curates had been orthodox and regular in their Lives, " People had been brought into a Liking to Episcopacy itself; and tho' it be the Opinion of some, that " it was too weak a ground of Suffering, not to hear " the Curates, yet we owe the Liberty enjoyed, since " the Revolution to their Steadiness in Suffering for " not hearing them." Now I leave it to the Apologist to tell me, that since we can without Suffering forbear hearing a Curate of the Church of *England*, if it be not advisable to forbear hearing such, lest we be

insensibly led into a Liking to Episcopacy itself, and so lose, make light, or be deprived of the Liberty, and Privileges, enjoyed since the Revolution ?

The Apologist proceeds to the Reasons inducing our Predecessors not to hear the Curates, but rather to suffer, and that none of these concern the hearing of Mr. *Whitefield*, except the Episcopacy, and Supremacy, which he reserves to the fourth and last Head.

Whatever Way the first Reason, why our Sufferers refused to hear the Curates doth concern Mr. *Whitefield*, the Apologist would have done well to consider that these Recusants refused to hear them before the Act 1663 was past ; and therefore there behoved to be another Reason than an Act that then had not a Being ; their Recusancy was the Reason of the Act, and not the Act the Reason of the Recusancy ; and therefore they spoke juster who had laid their Recusancy upon the Prelates and their Curates, their Defection from the Covenant Reformation-work, from which the *English* Episcopal Ecclesiasticks cannot purge themselves, if the Apologist allow the Solemn League and Covenant to be binding upon Posterity. As for the Part that Mr. *Whitefield* acts among us, in Reference to Episcopacy, that will come in afterwards upon the Head of his Doctrine and Character.

The second Reason for not hearing the Curates, was their being thrust in without the Consent of the People. Is not this the Case of many Congregations in *Scotland*, where they have been denied unexceptionable Choices ? Yet now the hearing of such is pressed ; and tho' this doth not concern Mr. *Whitefield*, who claims not a Relation to any Parish in *Scotland* ; yet it so far concerns him, as that he would have the People reconciled to the Ministry of such Intruders, against whom my old Presbyterian Acquaintances did once cry, as much out as any, but now it seems Mr. *Whitefield* hath reclaimed them from their narrow Ways of thinking.

As the Apologist passes the Reason from the Episcopacy and Supremacy till afterwards, so will I, his third Reason ; for Reasons that will then appear.

Their

Their fourth Reason, that they might not harden Malignants in their Opposition to Presbytery, nor induce the godly to such Compliances, nor intail Prejudices upon Posterity, is stronger against Hearing or employing Mr. *Whitefield* than the Apologist is aware. I am sure were there a Plot to establish Episcopacy in *Scotland*, it might be alledged, that it would not disoblige, at least, the Employers and Hearers of Mr. *Whitefield*; and it is Fact, that the Example of some Presbyterians, hath induced others to hear him, of which, I have all moral Assurance, they do repent; and for the Prejudice intailed upon Posterity, it appears too obvious, when such Practices have reduced so many of the present Generation to an Indifferency whether it be Church of *England*, or Church of *Scotland*.

I shall pass over the Apologist's Charge of Ignorance of Presbyterian Principles, upon them who complain of those, that run after the *English* Priest, till I come to the Period of Time in which Presbyterians were Hearers of Episcopal Ministers. Neither can I stay to notice his Doctrine of Offence, Sin and Duty, as if they could not have forborn Hearing Mr. *Whitefield* without Sin, or being out of their Duty; I expect shortly, they will not only apologize for their Hearing him, but will charge Sin upon them that do it not, since Things are written by the Apologist that insinuate this, and not a few of Mr. *Whitefield*'s Votaries speak broad enough on this Head; but they have their strong Arguments for convincing us in Reserve.

If our Forefathers refused to hear the Curates, because guilty of Schism, as in other Respects, so in this, that they broke Union with such, to whom, they were bound to adhere, both from antecedent moral Obligations, and the super-added Ties of the national Oath, the same fifth Reason should have determined our present Presbyterians not to have employed, nor attended Mr. *Whitefield*'s Ministry, who, if we allow Presbytery to be of divine Right, was under an antecedent moral Obligation to maintain it. His unacquaintedness with it can be no Excuse, since, *Ignoran-*

tia Legis non excusat a peccato; and since he had Access to be among Presbyterians, he hath not given up with, but still retains his Episcopacy; and if the Apologist will allow the Solemn League and Covenant to be binding upon Posterity, he is under that supperadded Tie also.

Our suffering Fathers, in my Opinion, argued strongly against Hearing the Curates, from the Appearance of evil, as the Apologist notices in the sixth Reason; and that a small Matter becomes great, when a Testimony is concerned in it, were it but an open Window, as in the Case of *Daniel*, and this admits of a close Application against hearing or employing Mr. *Whitefield*, superseding other Considerations, at a Time, when so many are making Light of Presbyterian Government, and so many Things have been done, and are doing to subvert it; and the Apologist is vastly mistaken when he insinuates, "that our Sufferers refused to hear the Curates, for this chief Reason, "that they had not Access to petition, protest, or "remonstrate, since in the first Episcopal Period, having Access to all these, they heard them." I will shew other weighty Reasons, besides what have been already given; and for the Practice of Presbyterians in the first Episcopal Period, it will be afterwards considered.

Their seventh Reason noticed by the Apologist turns upon the Validity of the Curates Ordination, and the Prelates taking upon them to re-ordain Presbyterian Ministers. He and his Authors will be found mistaken in this, unless he mean what was done by the *English* Bishops, to our apostate Presbyters when they were to be drubbed Bishops; for such Ministers as conformed with Prelacy being ordained after 1649, they were to receive Presentation from the Patron, and Collation from the Bishop; but this Collation was not Ordination, or to use the Episcopal Stile was not Institution. But what is all this in Reference to Mr. *Whitefield* and his Hearers, unless it be to teach us to question the goodness of his Ordination, or to say that our Ancestors

tors
beca
he c
to s
ing
then
to t
his
per
from
T
of M
take
"
"
"
"
"
mi
in
of
use
por
na
the
me
J
M
ci
ye
th
"
"
th
m
n
t
f
f
i

tors suffered on a wrong Ground? Will it follow that because we would not re-ordain Mr. *Whitefield*, were he conforming with Presbytery, that therefore we are to submit to his Ministrations while Episcopal, he laying aside some Things wrong in Worship? If it follow, then by the same Parity of Reason, we may submit to the Ministrations of a Romish Priest, laying aside his Idolatrous Worship, tho' not giving up with Popery, for we do not re-ordain such when converted from Popery.

The Apologist runs so fast in defending the Hearing of Mr. *Whitefield*, that he runs himself into some Mistakes injurious to our worthy Ancestors, "As Page 18. 19. That our Church did not much mind who were the Administrators of the external Form of Ordination, provided the Men were duly qualified, and that they neglected the external Call by Ordination, as in the Case of Mr. *Robert Bruce*." He might have said this of all the Presbyterian Ministers in *Scotland* before the Establishing of the second Book of Discipline. But because during all that Time, they used not Imposition of Hands, he is void of the Purpose, when he denies them an outward Form of Ordination, or of setting Men apart to the Ministry. Let the Apologist and his Revisers read the Book of Common-Order of the *English* Kirk at *Geneva*, whereof *John Knox* was Minister, on the manner of electing Ministers, and that Chapter of our first Book of Discipline concerning Ministers, and their lawful Election; you will there find that it is so far from Fact, what the Apologist alledges Page 19. "That our Church seemed to neglect the external Call by Ordination more than they ought;" that they declare, that the Vocation of a Minister, consists in Election, Examination, and Admission. If there cannot be an Ordination or Call without Imposition of Hands, indeed these Worthies had not Ordination; but they understood even the outward Form of Ordination, in more substantial Respects, as they themselves declare, than in Imposition of Hands; and I assure you, that if I thought

thought that the outward Form of Ordination consisted in the Imposition of Hands, I would boldly assert, that the Episcopal Ordination is void and null, it not being the Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery; but since there is an Election, such as it is, Examination and Admission, to the Work of the Ministry, I dare not declare the Episcopally ordained to be no Ministers; but presently to infer my submitting to their Ministrations on that Account, as hath been noticed, will not follow.

The eighth Reason the Apologist adduces for our Sufferers their not hearing the Episcopalians, because of their Dependence on the Supremacy, he leaves it to be considered in Reference to the Subject in Hand, to his fourth Head, and so shall I. All that is necessary to be noticed of the Use he makes of their ninth Reason, you have it, in what I have offered on the first and fifth Reasons.

Now, I have gone through the Reasons, why our Fore-fathers choosed suffering, rather than submit to hear Episcopal Ministers, as they are collected, and applied by the Apologist, excepting the third, which I have in Reserve for a proper Place. But before I pass from this Part of the Author's Methods, I must notice what he says, Page 21. "That he hath not designedly omitted any Thing material in our Sufferer's Reasons for not hearing Episcopal Ministers." I am unwilling to judge the Gentleman's Designs, or that of any christian Man's, further than their Words and Actions do warrant me. But the second Reason in the Apologetical Relation, I did not find mentioned by him; in my Opinion, it pleads strongly against hearing or employing the *English* Priest; it needs no Comment of mine, I transcribe it intirely, and let it speak for itself. "By giving Obedience to this Act, (that is, of hearing the Episcopalians) they should be in Hazard not only of falling away into a detestible Neutrality and Indifferency about the Matters of God, but ere long they should be in Hazard to fall away in Heart and Affection from the Cause of
" Christ.

“ Christ, and from the Work of Reformation sworn
 “ to and owned so much; for there is no Way now
 “ apparent, whereby the Difference shall be kept up
 “ betwixt such as honestly mind the covenanted Work
 “ of Reformation, and the corrupt, prelatical and ma-
 “ lignant Party, but this of refusing to give Obedi-
 “ ence to this Act. So that as it is already too too ap-
 “ parent that some who had no Scruple to hear these
 “ Men, and withal thought to abide constant to the
 “ Cause of God, were ere long found to be deceived;
 “ for Piece and Piece the Edge of their Zeal was blun-
 “ ted, and their Affection to the Work of God cooled,
 “ and they at length were brought to condemn it. So
 “ dangerous a Thing it is to suffer the standing difference
 “ to wear out of Sight. So that let a Man begin once
 “ to countenance those Men, as lawfully called and au-
 “ thorized Ministers, and by this Means keep up no
 “ standing Difference, he shall, ere he be aware, slide
 “ into their Camp and side with them in all Things.
 “ Therefore it is best to keep up this Distance and
 “ standing Difference by withdrawing.”

The Apologist triumphs, as if none of our Sufferers
 Reasons for not hearing the Curates, do obtain in Re-
 spect to them and Mr. *Whitefield*; but I think, it will
 appear that all of them in one Respect or another, are
 applicable to the present Case: But, what tho’ they
 were not applicable, especially the above Reason, that
 seems to have escaped the Apologist? Do the Employ-
 ers and Hearers of an *English* Curate well, in such a
 Time of Degeneracy and Neutrality about Presbyterian
 Principles, in the Manner they do, to countenance
 him?

The Apologist in his third Head endeavours to justi-
 fy Presbyterians, their hearing of Mr. *Whitefield* from
 the first Period of Episcopacy in *Scotland*; tho’ for Rea-
 sons offered by him, they acted otherwise after the Re-
 storation; but I am surprised, that he should attempt
 to justify the *Whitefieldian* Presbyterians from the first
 Episcopal Period; when, in Pag. 24. compared with
 Pag. 22. he says, “ That the Apologies offered by
 “ our

“ our Authors after the Restoration, for the Diversity
 “ of Practice in the first Period by hearing the Epif-
 “ copal Incumbents, while those of the Period after the
 “ Restoration refused it, appear too weak and insuffi-
 “ cient for justifying the first Period.” I am sure,
 the Apologists after the Restoration meant not to ju-
 stify the Diversity of Practice ; our Apologist says their
 Arguments are insufficient, and I think so too, that
 they are not sufficient to justify the Conformities, then
 really made, or which are alledged to be made with
 the Episcopal Incumbents, especially to use the Apo-
 logist's Words, that Episcopacy and Supremacy were
 then fully established by Law.

Tho' I will not take upon me to justify those Pres-
 byterians that conformed with Episcopacy in the first
 Period ; I am so far from that, that I am of the Mind
 that there were Things omitted and committed by them
 in the first Period of Prelacy's Rise, Establishment and
 Progress, that it had been better frankly to have con-
 fess'd it, than justifying their Conformities, to draw
 that into a Precedent for justifying any like Practice
 now. Yet, this I may say, as I did in the Beginning,
 that very often the best of Men have been put to it what
 part to act in trying and straitning Times, and often
 have acted such a part, that if they had seen or su-
 spected the Consequences, they would not have acted.
 And this, I think the proper Apology to be made for
 them who conformed in hearing Episcopalians at that
 Time ; but this doth by no Means justify the hearing
 of them now, because tho' I extenuate the Fault,
 as to the Period referred to, I do not justify the Prac-
 tice as no Fault ; and this is a shorter Way with
 an Argument taken from the Practice of that Period,
 than perhaps the Apologist was expecting, and this
 might answer all his Reasoning from that Period. But
 the Apologist abounds so much with blundering Mi-
 stakes, when he is upon that Period, and is comparing
 it with that after the Restoration, that the taking some
 Notice of them, and the clearing up the Matter a
 little

little, may shew the Weakness of his swaggering Argument taken from the first Episcopal Period.

The Apologist owns, that in the first Period, Episcopacy and Supremacy were fully established by Law; but Pag. 25th, that it was never required then of the People to hear, as a Test of their Approbation of the Supremacy and Episcopacy, as after the Restoration; therefore the Presbyterians continued hearing still. Now, to prove, that as much was done in the first Period, I refer you to *Calderwood's History*, Pag. 639. "Where, after the *Glasgow Assembly 1610*, where Episcopacy and the Supremacy were acknowledged, you have a terrible Proclamation from the King, commanding all his Subjects of whatever Sort, to obtemper, obey, and not impugn any Article, &c. of that Assembly, &c. and commanding all Judges and Magistrates, That, if they do hear, or understand of any Preacher, &c. or Subject whatsoever, who break this Commandment, that presently they be committed to Prison. Pag. 649. *Anno 1614*. Upon the fourth of *March*, the Ministers were commanded by Proclamation, with Sound of Trumpet, at the Cross of *Edinburgh*, to prepare the People for the *Lord's Supper* against *Easter*; and the People were charged to communicate that Day at their Parish Kirks." It would be tedious to relate all the Instances of arbitrary Power of the King and Bishops in this Period, both after the Assembly at *Glasgow* in 1610, and *Perth Assembly 1618*. whose Articles were ratified in Parliament, enacting all the Recusants to be punished with Rigor and Extremity, as many Ministers were, as well as People; of which, any Person may read ample Accounts in *Calderwood's History*; there they may satisfy themselves, and see that I am not imposing upon them. And Pag. 733. "You will see the high Commission impowered to call Non-communicants as well as others before them."

It is like, the Apologist will say, That those were condemnable Severities; and tho' he does not justify, but condemn the Corruptions of the Assemblies 1610

and 1718. the King but ratifies their Deeds, and the Supremacy in its Exercise is not used as in the Act of Parliament 1663.

But, to this I answer, and let any Man judge. The King, in Virtue of his Prerogative, calls the Assembly 1610; that Assembly ratifies his Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical; and he, by his Proclamations and Laws, discharges any Opposition to the contrary by any Subject whatsoever. I think these Things just as bad, as what was done *Anno* 1663. But if the Apologist wants an Instance, and a rampant one, of the Exercise of Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical, without, or before the Kirk do any Thing, you have it in the fore-mentioned Proclamation, *Anno* 1614. concerning *Easter*, for the giving the Communion then; for this was not appointed by a general Assembly till the Year 1616. And this drew deeper than simply the hearing of the Curates did.

The Apologist's second Difference of those Periods, is as full of Mistakes; for the Intrusion of Ministers obtained in the first as well as second Period, since the Manner of planting of Churches was the same in the first Episcopal Period as in the second, *viz.* by Presentation of the Patron, and Collation of the Bishop; and the Matter of Intrusion could not, yea, was not carried higher in the second than in the first Period, as appears by the Act of Parliament 1612. And it is but *gratis Dictum*, in the Apologist, that the Ministers so ordained were submitted to by their Flocks, they having the same Provocation there was after the Restoration, Curates being thrust in upon them, after many of their worthy Pastors were, for their Non-conformity, deprived and otherwise persecuted by the high Commission Court: Of which Severity *Calderwood* abounds with Instances, with which any Person may satisfy himself, if he thinks I am telling a Story; and of which I should have given Instances, but I have already transgress'd the Bounds of a Missive.

The Apologist speaks, I am afraid, without due Reflexion, that the Incumbents of the first Episcopal Period,

Period, had not abjured Episcopacy as those of the second had done. But admit they had not done it personally, was not the national Covenant abjuring the Hierachy, which their Fathers took, binding upon them? Or, can the Apologist assert, that all the Curates in 1663 had personally abjured Episcopacy? Can he assure me that all the Ministers who took the Covenant in 1590 were dead 1610? Or that none of them took the Covenant in 1590 conformed with Episcopacy in 1610? But, to go surely to Work, let any compare the Names of the Ministers, and Places to which they belonged, mentioned in *Calderwood*, Pag. 251. and 252. with the List of the Members of *Glasgow* Assembly 1610. p. 626. and 627. and they will find that many of them who took the Covenant in 1590 were Members of the Assembly 1610 that settled Episcopacy. I should allow the Apologist to use a presumptive Argument, that tho' they were Members of that Assembly, they might not be all Consenters to the Settlement of Prelacy, if something in the King's Letter, calling that Assembly, had not broken the Force of that Argument, at least made the Presumption strongest on my Side, *viz.* That they were Art and Part in that Mischief. The King's Letter in *Calderwood*, Pag. 621. and 622. might be worth a Person's Reading, particularly the Words so fit to my Purpose, *viz.* " And because by our Letters, we have particularly acquainted the Arch-Bishop of St. *Andrews* with our Purpose herein, and sent unto him a special Note of the Names of such, as we desire to be at our said Meeting. It is our Pleasure you conform hereto, and make Choice of such Persons." Thus the King, to secure his Point, wrote to Presbyteries. I might offer much more on this, but I am wearied before I be half done.

The Apologist's fourth State of the Difference between the two Periods, labours under the same Mistakes with the former; for they were as strongly inhibited in the first as in the second Period; as in the fore-mentioned terrible Proclamation emitted after the *Glasgow* Assembly; and tho' they are said to petition,

they did it at their Peril, as we may see in *Calderwood*, from Pag. 677. and foreward, how much some Ministers were prosecuted and persecuted for their protesting against the Corruptions of the Time. Read also from Pag. 725. and you will see how hardly the Ministers were used, who in their Sermons, testified against the Evils of the Kirk. See more of this from Pag. 760. and foreward, how hardly Protesters and Petitioners were treated.

As to the Apologist's 5th from Mr. *Davidson's* Letter 1597, it not being within any of the Periods referred to; we have nothing to do with it, unless it had contained something in it justifying them who subvert the Government of this Church; but it being the Reverse of this, it makes nothing for his Purpose.

I might bring in several historical Testimonies against the Apologist's 6th, "That there was no such Objections
" as Errors in Doctrine, and Immoralities of Life, against the Episcopal Ministers of the first, as those
" of the second Period." But I shall only refer him to the Synod of *Galloway's* Supplication, Anno 1661. against the intended Change of Government, which he will find in the Appendix to the first Volume of *Woodrow's* History, where you have the following Words.
" Episcopacy hath always been attended in this Land
" with manifold Corruptions in Doctrine, Worship and
" Manners. How did Popery, Arminianism, and Socinianism sound in our Pulpits? Was it not in the
" Time of lordly Episcopacy? Then it was that the pure
" Worship of God was polluted with human Inventions, &c. then Episcopal Connivances at the grossest
" Scandals;" and much more than I stay to transcribe. But, as I have said, many Instances of their Unsoundness, and Immorality, in this Period could be adduced. So that this will not distinguish the Periods.

But if I prove, that it was the Opinion of the most eminent Presbyterians of the first Period, that the Abettors, and Promoters of Prelacy, should be censured, and withdrawn from; and that many of the People did withdraw from them, and were persecuted on that

Account;

account; I am afraid the Apologist will make but a poor Hand of his Argument, taken from the Conduct of Presbyterians in the first Period.

It is to my purpose, and well worth transcribing, what Mr. *James Melvil*, Anno 1609. writes to a con-
 demned Brother, when he saw Matters going to Wreck in the Church. See *Cald.* p. 614. If ye ask yet, *Men and Brethren what shall we do?* Answer, "1. Cry and complain to Christ, filling Heaven and Earth with Lamentations, for the Captivity and Desolations of *Sion*, &c. 2. To publish to all Christians our just Grievs, how our Kirk is oppressed by Authority, circumveened by Craft, and kept in Thralldom, against God's Word, her own Constitutions, and against the Privileges, and Laws of our Realm, granted to her. 3. I would have these *Balsams*, &c. that have sold the Birth-right of Christ's Inheritance for a Mess of Pottage, those Imprisoners and Tormentors of their Brethren, after due Admonition, to be painted out in their Colours and Proceedings; *Lastly*, If that Spirit of Action, Zeal and Courage, that sometimes did mightily ring in our Kirk, were kindled again, that might make a few from every Presbytery and Province, to conven together in the Name of Christ, and censure these Corrupters of the Kirk to the uttermost." Read also in *Calderwood*, 743. a Letter from that eminent Martyr Mr. *John Welsh*, to Mr. *Robert Bruce*, another eminent Witness, Anno 1619. a Part of which doth follow, "They are no more to be counted Orthodox, but Apostates, they are fallen from their Callings, &c. and are no more to be counted Christians, but Strangers, Apostates, and Persecutors; and therefore, not to be heard any more, either in Publick, or in Consistories, Colleges, or Synods." For what Fellowship hath Light with Darknes? Is it like, that these Men would have justified the hearing or joining with the Prelates, or their Offspring, whom they would have thus severely censured, and do so highly condemn, and advise that they be withdrawn from.

That

That the People of that Period, were not such Conformists with their Ministers, as the Apologist alledges, I refer for Proof, to the Ministers of *Edinburgh* their Invectives against the People. *Calderwood* 785 and Page 805. But to put the Matter beyond all Doubt, and to stop the Apologist's Mouth at once; we shall get much Light from a Council Proclamation, *Ann.* 1624. See for it *Calderwood*, Page 810. The account of that matter followeth. "The Ministers of *Edinburgh* alledging before the Council, that they could have no Peace with the People, so long as other Ministers, especially the deprived and silenced resorted to the Town and kept private Conventicles, a Charge was given, which was published the Day following; that none meet or conven in any private House, or Place, to preaching, Exhortation, or such religious Exercises, except those of the Family, or their Friends resorting for other Causes; that they attempt not to impugn by Discourse or Disputation, Word, or Write, the true Religion, or Discipline of the Kirk approved by his Majesty's Laws, with false Suggestions, as if he persecuted the true Religion. We have of late known to our unspeakable Grief, a Number of our Subjects misled by turbulent and restless Ministers, either deprived of their Functions, or silenced for just Causes, to debauch and seduce their Neighbours, affecting Purity, &c. above others, disobeying the King and their Pastors, impugning the Doctrine, controlling the ordinary Discipline, abstaining to hear the Word preached, and have disorderly strayed to other Congregations, &c." I refer to the Paper *ad longum*. I am weary transcribing. The Apologist may alledge from *Calderwood*, Page 811, that they did not abstain from hearing the Word preached, when their own Pastors were preaching in their Parish-kirks, tho' they took the Opportunity of hearing others. What the Historian says, must be interpreted in a consistency with himself, when he tells us, "That Christians when they had Occasion of a sound and zealous Minister, to stir them up in these

" Times

“ Times of Defection, they met together; for the
 “ Pulpit of *Edinburgh* founded all the contrary Way,
 “ and *Arminian* Preachers possessed the most eminent
 “ Places, and were not only tolerated, but countenan-
 “ ced, because in publick Doctrine they maintained
 “ the Prelates usurped Power.” The People would
 not readily hear such, and convene with others
 also: therefore their own Pastors must be understood,
 of such as held fast the Truth, and either were not as
 yet thrust out, or had occasional Access to their Pul-
 pits. After this, we read in our Historian of a severe
 Persecution against many eminent Ministers.

But there is one great Gun of the Apologist's, p. 16.
 “ That the *Melvils* and other Ministers, in 1606. cal-
 “ led up to *London*, did at the Command of the King
 “ hear the *English Bishops*, and Deans; if these great
 “ Men had thought it a Sin in its Nature, to hear
 “ Persons, who held Episcopacy and Supremacy for
 “ their Principle, no Command of the King would
 “ have made them submit to it; but on the contrary,
 “ Mr. *Calderwood* mentions no Scruple that any of
 “ them had in the Matter, but that they did it as oft
 “ as desired by the King.”

All I shall say of those Worthies, their hearing Epis-
 copalians in *England*, shall be to observe, that it was
 occasional only, not stated; it was by the Force of
 the King's Command, and not of Choice; and that
 if their Persons had not been in the King's Hands,
 and they at this Time his Prisoners at large, we had
 not heard of their being tossed about from Place to
 Place, one Church and Chapel to another, and they
 could not be supposed to have heard them, as
 joining with them, or expecting any Edification by
 them; when p. 543. *Calderwood* tells us, That, in
 one of the Sermons they heard from Dr. *King*, he had
 a most virulent Invektive against the Presbyterians,
 crying to the King, “ Down, down with them.”
 How far the Apologist hath given a fair Account of
 the Matter from *Calderwood*, that they did not scruple
 to hear such Preachers, I refer to p. 542. where
 the

the two *Melvils* having exprefs Command to come to the King's Chapel, Mr. *James* warned Mr. *Andrew*, that they were to be trapped, and to have their Patience tried. The Historian proceeds in telling what Trinkets he saw on the Altar; upon which Mr. *Andrew Melvil* made that Epigram, p. 548. for which he was troubled; and how uneasy it was to them to be ordered to the House of *English Ecclesiasticks*, the Progress of that Story shews abundantly; a sufficient Evidence how disagreeable Fellowship and Intimacy with such was to these great Men. Now, tho' our Apologist had said more than he hath done, for proving, that our Presbyterians scrupled not to hear Episcopalians in a straitning Time, his Arguments for the real or alledged Practice of poor sinful Men in a Time of Tentation, do not conclude for the Warrantableness of the Practice, nor justify the like Practice, where there are not the same Reasons, nor extenuate the Fault, where there are not the same Tentations.

Before I proceed to the Apologist's fourth Head, for justifying the hearing of Mr. *Whitefield*, from the *Westminster* Confession, and the Solemn League and Covenant, I shall offer some Things, shewing how far it is unlawful, or may be concluded unlawful, to hear an Episcopal Minister, or embrace their Ministry, to use the Apologist's Stile concerning Mr. *Whitefield*.

The Question is not concerning an occasional or accidental Hearing of an Episcopal, but such a hearing as the Apologist p. 23 calls, an embracing of his Ministry; and let me add, such a hearing, as is the Effect of an Invitation given to such to minister Gospel Ordinances to them.

The Question is not of such a hearing as a Person may give, to gratify their Curiosity, to see how a Person will acquit himself, or what he will say on such, or such a Subject. This is not a hearing that imports an embracing of their Ministry: Tho' even in this, I wish there were with us an acting in the Matter of hearing from better Principles. The itching Ear is condemned; and hath dangerous Effects, 2 *Tim.* iv. 3, 4. *After their own Lusts*
they

they shall heap to themselves Teachers, having itching Ears, and they shall turn away their Ears from the Truth. The Israelites were to be so satisfied with the Ordinances of God, that they were not to enquire how the Nations served their Gods, Deut. xii. 30. Take heed to thyself, that thou be not snared by following them, and that thou enquire not after their Gods, saying, How did these Nations serve their Gods? Even so will I do.

The Question is not concerning an involuntary hearing of such, when a Person cannot shun it, unless he stop his Ears, as when their Persons are at the dispose of another, as in the Case of our Ministers at London, in the Year 1606; but such a hearing as is the Effect of a free Choice, and Liking to their Ministry. The first may obtain, when the other doth not, yea ought not.

Neither is the Question concerning such a hearing, as may be between Persons differing in their Principles of Episcopacy and Presbytery, but not as yet clearly determined either Way, but reasoning the Matter together, about Light in the Matter, and hearing reciprocally for this End. That is not the present Case. How far it may be alledged on Mr. *Whitefield's* Side, I do not find the Apologist as yet come the Length of giving this for the Reason of his and his Friends hearing Mr. *Whitefield*.

Nor is the Question about hearing Episcopalians found on the Doctrine of Grace, and maintaining purity of Worship, who themselves are as much Episcopal in their Judgment as they, or are only in Doubt about Episcopacy. But the Question is, of their hearing that are at a Point about it, that Prelacy belongs to the *Romish* Hierarchy, and is contrary to, and subversive of the Government which Christ hath established in his House, and which in *England* derives its Establishment from the King, as supreme in Causes Ecclesiastical, as in the Papacy, it doth from the Pope.

Neither is it the Question about the hearing one, tho' Episcopal in his Judgment, preach the Doctrine of Grace, and practise a pure Worship, where People

are invincibly deprived of Access to any Ordinance dispensed by another. When the Case is so circumstanced, it is allowed, that People may embrace the Instructions, let me call it the Ministry, of any among them, capable to discharge that Duty, tho' never before in any ecclesiastical Office, and in that Case of invincible Necessity, such a Person may become their Pastor.

The Question then comes to this; May any Person professing himself a Presbyterian, and believing the Presbyterian Church Government to be the Ordinance of Jesus Christ, the only King and Head of his Church; and also believing Prelacy to be the Invention of Man, and an order of Government opposite to, and subversive of the Government which Christ hath appointed in his Church, and being under superadded Solemn Ties, to maintain this Presbyterian Government, and to oppose and extirpate Prelacy; such a Person enjoying a Gospel Ministry, dispensing Christ's Ordinances, maintaining the same presbyterian Principles, and opposing the same Prelacy: I say, according to this state of the Case, may any such Person lawfully hear and embrace the Ministry of one maintaining and holding the Episcopal Hierarchy and Supremacy of the King in Matters ecclesiastical, substituted in the Room of the usurped Supremacy of the Pope; such a Person never having renounced this Episcopacy and Supremacy, nor made Profession of presbyterian Principles before any presbyterian Church Judicature?

I think this is the proper State of the present Controversy; so that I will plainly assert, that the hearing and embracing the Ministry of an Episcopalian, by any professed Presbyterian, is unlawful, and inconsistent with his professed Principles, and solemn Ties and Obligations; and consequently the Hearing, and as the Apologist explains it, the embracing the Ministry of Mr. *Whitefield*, a professed Episcopalian, which he hath never yet renounced any where, that I know of, and never as yet before any Presbyterian Church Judicature,

linance
circum
ace the
among
ever be
e of in
ne their

ature, must also be unlawful to any professed Presby-
erian.

I should think this State of the Case, so convincing,
s every real and unbiaſſed Presbyterian would present-
y conclude the ſame Thing with me, both from the
Word of God, the Principles and Standards of this
Church.

Person
ng the
dinance
church;
Man,
subver-
ointed
Solemn
, and
enjoy-
ances,
d op-
s ſtate
r and
olding
King
of the
never
, nor
any

It will ſtill be remembred, that I am ſpeaking of
ſuppoſed Presbyterians, who are bound to ſtand faſt in
it as the Doctrin of Chriſt, and to receive and ap-
prove, and embrace ſuch Teachers who teach them to
obſerve all Things whatſoever Chriſt hath commanded;
and ought not to receive them, who bring not the Doc-
trine of Chriſt, but ſhould avoid them who cauſe Of-
fences and Diviſions, contrary to the Doctrin they
have learned; and who are bound to ſtand at the
greateſt Diſtance from Sin, *1 Theſ. v. 22. Jude 23.*
And are not to be Partakers of other Mens Sins, 1 Tim.
v. 22. Who ought to beware of falſe Prophets, and
ſuch as walk not according to the received Ordinances.
2 Theſſ. 3. 6. Chriſt's Sheep hear not Strangers, but
flee from them, *Joh. 10. 27. Theſe that practically act*
the Foxes, muſt be taken away, Cant. ii. 15. The Saints
muſt guard againſt them, who ly in wait to deceive,
and we are not to be toſſed to and fro with every Wind of
Doctrin, Eph. iv. 14. 2 Theſſ. ii. 2, 3. Whereunto we
have already attained, let us walk by the ſame Rule,
let us mind the ſame Thing, *Phil. iii. 16.* If Anti-
chriſt prevailed in the Church by a gradual Falling
away from the Doctrin of Chriſt, and the Purity of
his Ordinances, the ſtrengthening the Hands of them
that hold faſt his wicked Hierarchy, is but a Healing
again the Wound he got among us, by the Purity of
our Reformation. And how offensive muſt it needs
be to embrace their Miniſtry who are authorized by
them that derive their Power from thoſe who uſurp
Chriſt's Prerogative Royal, as King and Head to his
Church, and who maintain this horrid Uſurpation by
a ſolemn Oath? *We are to hold faſt the Profeſſion of*
our Faith without wavering, Heb. x. 23. All Truth
muſt

must be held and practically avowed, nothing of Christ's is to be talked of, as little or indifferent. *Matth. v. 19.* And if such who do teach so, are in Christ's account little and despised, their Ministry is not to be embraced.

It would take a Volume, let be a tedious Missive to launch out into the Argument, and make Application of the Case, as stated, to Mr. *Whitefield* and his Hearers, or Embracers of his Ministry. But since I cannot overtake that, I shall refer what might be added and amplified upon, to my Answers to what remains of the Author's Defences for their hearing and embracing the Ministry of Mr. *Whitefield*.

I am aware, that the Apologist, or any sly Assistant, or Reviser of his Performance, will be ready to say, that I have stated the Question, concerning the hearing and embracing the Ministry of an Episcopalian, and consequently of the *English* Priest, upon a Heap of Circumstances, and have declin'd the Question, how far the Hearing of an Episcopalian, as Mr. *Whitefield*, is in its Nature unlawful.

An unthinking Person may apprehend upon such an Alledgance, that I have done so; if I have done it, I can say it was not my Intent; perhaps the Apologist and I may differ about the Notion of an Action's Lawfulness, or Unlawfulness in its Nature. I own, that the physical Act of Hearing, hath nothing of Lawfulness or Unlawfulness in it, but when we come to the Morality of the Act, we must take it in Circumstances; yet am I not declining the Consideration of that Act, in its Nature; for my old Philosophy taught me long since, that what may be a Circumstance to an Action physically considered, may be Essential to it morally considered; and if it would not transgress on Modesty, I might offer to defy the Apologist to show me any alledged Circumstance, in my State of the Case, of hearing Episcopal Ministers, that doth not affect the Morality of that Action.

But give, tho' not grant, that my State of the Case should wave the Consideration of the Question about the

the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of hearing Episcopalian-
ans, and only determined the Question from supposed
Circumstances, and not from the Thing in it's Nature,
which yet I deny, if these Circumstances do affect his,
and his Friend's Conduct in embracing the Ministry of
Mr. *Whitefield*; I think, it will follow, that they have
not said any Thing to defend their Conduct and Pra-
ctice.

Let all the alledged Circumstances be tried, and appli-
ed, I can bear this with all imaginable Calmness.

1. The Apologist and his Friends profess themselves
to be Presbyterians, and that our presbyterian-Church
Government is the Ordinance of Jesus Christ, the King and
Head of his Church. 2. They own Prelacy p. 24. to
be an Error, and a great Incroachment on the christian
Church. 3. They are under solemn Ties to oppose
and abolish Prelacy, and to maintain Presbytery. 4.
They deny not that they have a Gospel Ministry oppo-
site to Prelacy, and professing Presbytery with them-
selves. 5. They cannot deny but Mr. *Whitefield* hath
taken the Oath of Supremacy, and is Episcopal. 6.
They must acknowledge that he hath neither renoun-
ced the Supremacy, nor Episcopacy, before any pres-
byterian-Church-Judicature, nor hath he made any
Profession of presbyterian-Principles. Now whatever
Way they may distinguish between Actions naturally, and
circumstantially considered, their countenancing and
embracing the Ministry of Mr. *Whitefield*, is contrary
to the many moral Obligations they are under, in Re-
ference to Presbytery and Prelacy; the maintaining the
one, and the endeavouring the Abolition of the other.

But says the Apologist, 28. 29. Pages, that Mr.
Whitefield's Episcopacy, and Oath of Supremacy, can-
not make that Deed so unlawful, as it would be in
a *Scotch* Presbyterian; and that Episcopacy, and the
Supremacy, however bad in themselves, are not so bad
in the *English* Clergy, or in Mr. *Whitefield*, bred up in
that Darkness, as in us. I shall freely allow, that the
greater Light, the greater Guilt; but this takes not a-
way the Guilt altogether, nor doth it justify their em-
bracing

bracing Mr. *Whitefield's* Ministry, before ever he renounces his Episcopacy and Supremacy, when they have able Men of their own Principles, neither for Episcopacy nor Supremacy, to hear. But then, altho' I allow that Mr. *Whitefield*, while being among the *English* Clergy, had not all the Advantages of being taught the Evil of Episcopacy, and the Supremacy; I should have been glad to hear, if the Apologist, or his other Admirers, have been able to make him renounce his Episcopacy, and Supremacy. Now since he holds these, can he plead Ignorance, after all the Pains taken upon him? Had Mr. *Whitefield* been conversant with the *English* Clergy, and lived, and died unenlightened as to Episcopacy, and the Supremacy; I should not have thought it Wonder, nor should I have brought it to a Question, how far he might, in other Respects, been useful among those of his own Way. But to bring him to *Scotland*, and to instruct him in the Evil of those Things, and he to hold them fast; and yet for Presbyterians, to embrace his Ministry, is an Action, that cannot be justified by his wanting the Means of knowing the Evil of Episcopacy and the Supremacy.

But says the Apologist, p. 28. "that he acknowledges no Head of the Church, but Jesus, and him only. p. 29. That he abhors every Principle inconsistent therewith. p. 30. That Mr. *Whitefield* by no Means adheres to the Supremacy in its Consequences."

There is not a Papist, but will assert, that there is no Head of the Church, but Jesus, and him only; but this they think doth not exclude the Headship of the Pope, as Christ's Vicar on Earth, since they give not the Headship to the Pope as to Christ, whom they will allow, to be so the Head of the Church, as none other, is the Head of it, in that Manner; and according as they understand the first Assertion, they will frankly say with Mr. *Whitefield* in the second, that they abhor every Principle inconsistent therewith, and the Church of *England*; at the same Time, they own the King the Head of the Church, they would be understood,

stood.
Head
cle.
field
ture,
as ma
W
field
quen
Engl
the H
mish
gain
be M
B
wha
hath
hear
pisco
of th
an;
wou
not
11.
"T
"f
"C
nou
Nat
the
Ch
be
bra
Mr
say
"
he
Ep
Ep

stood, as giving him no Power inconsistent with the Headship of Christ ; as is to be seen in their 37 Article. Therefore to prevent all Ambiguity, Mr. *Whitefield* should come in before some ecclesiastical Judicature, and in explicate Terms, renounce the Supremacy, as maintained in the Church of *England*.

What the Apologist says in p. 30. that Mr. *Whitefield* doth not adhere to the Supremacy in it's Consequences, would need Explication ; for one Effect of the *English* Supremacy is, the casting off the Supremacy of the Pope. There are who suspect him of being a *Romish* Emissary : The Apologist should have guarded against all Expressions strengthening the Suspicion, if these be Mr. *Whitefield's* Words, it looks the worse.

But admit he had clearly renounced the Supremacy, what hath he done as to his Episcopacy ? I hope, he hath not renounced it, else the Author's Apology for hearing him, should not have been, for hearing an Episcopal, but for proving that he who once was a Priest of the Church of *England*, is now become a Presbyterian ; but this he hath not said, as well knowing that it would have been a Falsehood ; which I hope, he would not have willingly written. It is true, he tells us, p. 11. that Mr. *Whitefield* hath declared from the Pulpit, " That our Presbyterian Church, (whatever were his former Sentiments) is the best constituted National Church upon Earth." Now, why doth he not renounce his Episcopacy, and join the best constituted National Church ? This gives but a very bad View of the Man, unless he looks upon the Government of the Church as indifferent, which may be clearly shown to be his Opinion, not a very inviting Argument to embrace his Ministry, when our Assembly 1581 deposed Mr. *Robert Montgomery* for teaching such Doctrine.

The Apologist p. 11. denies not his Episcopacy, but says, " that he appears among us, as a Presbyterian, " laying aside all that belongs to Episcopacy." I wish he had told us what he means by Things belonging to Episcopacy, since it is Fact, he hath not renounced his Episcopacy. The mere laying aside his Episcopal Gown and

and Rose, would be a poor Argument for me, to embrace his Ministry. If you say, he hath laid aside his *English* Forms. The best Proof of his Disposition that Way, would be, if he were employed in an *English* Meeting-House. I can assure you, ' upon good Authority, that he read Prayers in a Presbyterian Meeting-House in *America*, and many of his Hearers assure me, that his Prayers are Collects in the Prayer-Book, pieced and tack'd together; and tho' a worthy Minister, a great Admirer of his, writes in a Letter of last Years Date, that he would not, upon his Return have any Thing to do with the Church of *England*, I hope, he will not deny his practising therewith, as he did before, and least he should be suspected upon his coming to *Scotland*, and communicating in any Congregation there, his adopted Extract annexed to the Letter sent to the Societies, - printed at *Edinburgh*, upon his last coming there, shews his Resolution, among the many Divisions of Christians, to live in Communion with the Church of *England*, p. 29. may make it appear, that he is for every Church as it comes, as the Revd. Mr. *Glasgow* of *Dundee*, hath shown how far he is mistaken in his Doctrine of Catholick Charity, from *Rom. xiv. 17.* That his Catholick Charity, is the Antinomian Charity.

But says the Apologist, " If Mr. *Whitefield* justified " his Episcopacy, by teaching us Arguments in Favour of it, he would have few Hearers." This is but a poor Apology, for embracing his Ministry, since he teaches an Indifferency, about any Form of Church Government, as if our Contendings about it, were no more, than as a contending about Meats and Drinks. This is both wrong Doctrine in it self, and at this Day unreasonable, tending to introduce the *Erastian* Episcopacy, and to establish that Supremacy, which he pretends to give up with. If I did not believe the Lord Jesus to have established a certain Government in his House, distinct from that of the Magistrate, I behoved either to derive all ecclesiastical Power from the Magistrate, or setting up any Form by pretended ecclesiastical Authority, I should maintain an *Imperium in Imperio*.

How

How far I am doing Justice to Mr. *Whitefield*, I refer to his Letter to the Societies ; and to pretend any Apology from what may be his meaning in that Letter, I refer you to his last *American Journal*, in his Conference with Dr. *Cutler*, where he asserts, speaking of Church Government, " That our Lord Jesus never required of his Disciples, that they should be one in that, yea it never was his Intent." Is not this to subvert, and disgrace, the Government Christ hath established in his Church ? Is it not to deny him the Honour, and Glory of a ruling governing Head to the visible Church ? Is it not to introduce Anarchy, and Confusion into the christian Church ? Or if there must needs be Order in it ; Is it not to give up all into the Hands of King or Pope ? If the Apologist hath forgotten his preaching such Doctrine, he may be assured that he hath printed it.

Now, supposing me to allow the Apologist's Account of the Practice of Presbyterians, in hearing the Curates in the different Periods, referred to, to be rightly laid; it says Nothing at all for inviting Mr. *Whitefield* to *Scotland* ; the hearing, and employing him ; because some People in difficult Circumstances in the Episcopal Period, heard them, especially, when, as the Apologist notices, p. 24. " The Ministers who remonstrated against Prelacy, were banished, others confined, and the rest submitted." Doth it follow that such People, would have called in an *English* Curate, to dispense Ordinances among them ; when they had their own presbyterian-Pastors to hear ? Or to bring the Case yet nearer, tho' such of their Ministers, and People who were devoted to Episcopacy, had called in such an one, would they have run after him, when they were in no Want of Pastors of their own Principle ? Except the Apologist had alledged and proven this, he hath said nothing to the Purpose in Hand, from any of the Episcopal Periods.

If he had said any Thing to the Purpose he should have condescended on some Period of Presbyteries Establishment in *Scotland* ; and shown us, that then, they

practised the Hearing, or made no Scruple to hear the Episcopalians ; and if he had proven any such Thing, since the Revolution, excepting this Instance as to Mr. *Whitefield*, he had said something for presbyterian-Practice, tho', pardon me, if I say, not for justifying that Practice. But he is so far from being able to prove any such allowed Practice, that I offer me to prove the contrary, from the Instructions given to the Committee for planting the North, *Anno* 1694 by which, " The Brethren are enjoined to be aware of practising, and entertaining promiscuous ministerial Communion, with such of the Incumbents, or others of the Episcopal Party, who are not taken into Communion, and a share of the Government, by the Judicatures of this Church ; and likewise of employing any Probationers, who are not licensed, and approved by the said Judicatures." And it is not past Remembrance, a Process against a presbyterian Minister, for going to hear an Episcopal Incumbent, in whose Parish he lodged on *Saturday's* Night ; at some considerable Distance from his own Parish Church. The Apologist will remember, that such of the Episcopal Incumbents, as had taken the Allegiance, were accountable to the Judicatures of the Church, for their Orthodoxy, Diligence, and Morality ; which Mr. *Whitefield* in his vague and wandering State, is not ; yet this did not warrand those of the presbyterian-Persuasion, to hear them ; far less, that presbyterian-Ministers should join in Communion with them.

Since the Apologist will not allow Mr. *Whitefield's* Episcopacy, or Supremacy, to be a Reason against hearing him ; as little should their Episcopacy and Supremacy have been a Reason against hearing them ; since, now the Supremacy, by a special Act of Parliament, was repealed ; as were all the Acts whereby it was made criminal, not to hear Episcopal Ministers ; and inasmuch as these Episcopal Incumbents, took the Allegiance to the King, who had abolished the Supremacy, they were like to plead as little for it, as Mr. *Whitefield* ; yet tho' all these Things stood thus, and the Episcopal Incumbents did not practise the *English* Forms, as Mr. *Whitefield* doth, where-ever they

are acceptable, and sundry of them preached sound Doctrine, and were regular in their Lives, yet neither presbyterian Ministers nor People held Communion with them.

If the Apologist would consult the Author to the Readers of *Rutherford's* Letters, he would find, that the Worthies who lived in the first Episcopal Period, in the Opinion of that Author, who was a noted Sufferer in the last Episcopal Period, stood their Ground; and kept their Distance better than he thought those in the last Period did. I refer you to the Place, yet cannot omit transcribing some of his Words, answering the Question, why the Sufferers in the first Period, were so much countenanced beyond those of the second? He says, "They gave to God as Kings, their Testimonies against the Corruption of their Times, whether in King, Parliament, or Church-men, had so much of Freedom, grave, and becoming Boldness in them, so much of holy Zeal, even for the least Concerns of Christ's Kingdom, upon which we are loath to state our Sufferings, &c. and he upon the other Hand, &c. declared, that he thought nothing too great to give them, &c. It was not the main Question of these Men in a suffering Time, how much they might let go, and yet keep the Substantials of Religion, &c." But as I said, I must refer to the Place it self, which will shew, that the suffering Author of that Epistle, takes to his own Time, the Blame of how far we might go, and not sin; and takes off the Imputation of such cowardly Arguings, from the Worthies in the first Period, who suffered, even when it could not be denied; but the Substantials of Religion, in the Sense of our Day, were retained; if they had been such Conformists, as the Apologist would have them to have been; we had neither heard of their Sufferings, nor of such Encomiums upon them.

But now says our Apologist, "The keeping Communion with Mr. *Whitefield* in the Ordinances of the Gospel, stands justified by the *Westminster* Confession of Faith, and Solemn League and Covenant."

Before I consider these, I may observe, that since he hath betaken himself to the Episcopal Camp, he might have been doing with the Weapons, with which they fight for their Ceremonies, *viz.* That they are not forbidden, tho' such an Argument would not have concluded for him more than for them; it would have at least been modefter, than to have said, "That their
" Communion with a Priest of the Church of *England*,
" stands justified either by the *Westminster* Confession, or Solemn League."

I approve of the Apologist, so far as he confutes an anonymous Author, in his Exceptions against the Solemn League and Covenant, and its binding Obligation upon Posterity, which he asserts, p. 32. 33. from it's having nothing sinful in it, and its being a superadded Tie to what is morally binding, promising to have no thing to do with it, when his anonymous Author, shews any particular Thing in the Covenant, to be sinful; but he surprises me, when he says, p. 30. "That we could not swear that Oath of the Solemn
" League, in several Respects," which I think may be very lawfully and dutifully done; if it hath no particular Thing in it, that is sinful.

As for the Word *extirpate*, in the Covenant, I am well enough content, to understand it no otherwise, than in a lawful Way to endeavour in my Place and Calling, the Extirpation of Prelacy; for I should have lived to an hundred Years, before I thought, that it meant an offering of Violence to the Persons of Prelates; nor can I see, that tho' that Oath were to be sworn at this Day, the Word *extirpate*, behooved to be altered, because, as the Apologist alledges in p. 32. "It would not now imply the Sense in which it was
" in the Days of the Covenant, conceived."

Now I wish the Apologist had told us, what Part of the Solemn League and Covenant, which binds us to maintain the presbyterian Church Government, and to the Abolition of Episcopacy, doth justify Presbyterians, at a Time, when an Indifferency about the Government of the Church, so much prevails, to call in

A Priest of the Church of *England*, who suiting himself to the humour of the Day, goes about maintaining an Indifferency about the Government of the Church, but yet among the many divisions of Christians, according to his adopted Extract, chooseth to live and dy in outward Communion with the Church of *England*. Hath this any Tendency in less or more, to extirpate Prelacy in any Sense of the Word, or to maintain Presbytery? Doth not this Practice run cross to the very Words of the Solemn League and Covenant, *viz.* "That we shall not suffer our selves directly or indirectly, to be divided or withdrawn from this blessed Union and Conjunction, whether to make Defection to the contrary Part, or to give ourselves to a detestable Indifferency or Neutrality in this Cause, &c."

There cannot be any Thing more opposite to the common Sense, and meaning of Words, than to say, "That the keeping Communion with Mr. *Whitefield* in the Ordinances of the Gospel, stands justified by the Solemn League and Covenant; notwithstanding of his Episcopacy and Supremacy." As little doth such a Practice, stand justified by the Covenanters their carriage towards those, who entred not into this Solemn Bond; and I should think, they were the Persons who understood the meaning of the Covenant, tho' truly we need not be beholden to them for any Gloss upon it, since it cannot apply to the Apologist's Words, till East be understood to be West, and North to be South.

I am aware the Apologist will be ready to say, that the Covenanters behooved to understand the solemn League as justifying the holding Communion with Episcopalians, and hearing them, notwithstanding of their Episcopacy and Supremacy, because this is justified by that Article of the *Westminster* Confession of Faith, concerning the Communion of Saints, *viz.* "that Saints by Profession, are bound to maintain an holy Fellowship and Communion in the Worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual Services, as tend to their mutual Edification, &c. which

" Com-

" Communion, as God offereth Opportunities, is to
 " be extended, to all those, who in every Place, call
 " on the Name of the Lord Jesus."

Altho' the Words of our excellent Confession, were more to the Apologist's Purpose than they are; he would need a greater Evidence of Mr. *Whitefield's* Saintship, than I have yet heard of; he hath not the common Attestations requisite for one, whom we commonly hear or employ in preaching the Gospel; his vain glorious Assertions concerning himself in his Journals and weekly Histories, do not illuminate his Saintship, but render it very exceptionable.

But passing this at present, and to proceed to the Quotation from the *Westminster* Confession, we commonly say, that an Argument, that proves too much, proves nothing; and that so is the Case, in the Use the Apologist makes of that Article of our Confession, will appear.

If that Article be understood without Exception, it proves too much, or as explained by the Apologist, Page 35. " that as soon as we are satisfied concerning
 " the Reality of a Person's Christianity, tho' we should
 " differ from him, in some Points, if these Points are
 " consistent with the Reality of his Christianity, we
 " are bound to keep Communion with him in Wor-
 " ship." The Apologist will not say, that the Church of *England's* Worship is inconsistent with the Reality of Christianity; now if I understand the Article in the Confession, without any Limitation, I must hold Communion with Saints of the Church of *England*, as I have Occasion, in their Worship. The Apologist is aware of this, and therefore he adds, Page 35. " that
 " we cannot submit to any Idolatry in our Worship,
 " or any other sinful Term of Communion." But I ask, If a Worship may not be corrupt, tho' not properly idolatrous? May not this corrupt Worship be practised by a Saint, tho' not imposed as a Term of Communion? Am I to join with a Saint in his corrupt Worship, tho' not imposing it on me as a Term of Communion?

The Apologist says, Page 35, " That a real Christian laying aside, whatever we except against in Worship, &c. we are there bound by the Confession and Covenant, to hold Communion with such in the Worship of God.

It is to be observed, how cautious the Apologist is, not to call the Worship of the Church of *England* corrupt, but to wrap up his Exceptions on the Head of Worship, in that of Idolatry, and sinful Terms of Communion; or in the General, of any Thing unlawful in their Worship. I wish he had told us in express Terms, if it be lawful to join in the Worship of the Church of *England*, that he come not afterwards with a back Stroke upon us, telling us, that such a Practice is justified by the *Westminster* Confession, Solemn League and Covenant.

If he allow the Worship of the Church of *England* to be corrupt, and the maintaining of that corrupt Worship, to be scandalous and offensive; ought I to join in Communion with that professed Saint, who maintains that corrupt Worship, tho' occasionally he joins with me in my Way of Worship? If the Discipline of Christ's House had free Course as it ought, is not a Practiser and Defender of a corrupt Worship, an Object of ecclesiastick Censure? Can he then be admitted to Christian Communion, even let him be a Saint, till he be recovered from his corrupt Principles, as to Worship? Whatever the Apologist may think, I am well warranted from the Word of God, not to hold Church Communion with such an One, nor to admit him to Church Communion with me, *2 Thess. iii. 6.* *We are to withdraw from the Brother that walks disorderly, and not according to the Traditions received from the Apostles.* Mr. Whitefield's conforming with the Church of *Scotland* when here, and with the Church of *England* when there; doth heighten and not lessen the Offence; for he cannot join in Worship with us, without condemning the Worship and Government of the Church of *England*, which we pray down; but to do this, and then practise after the Church of *England* Way,

Way, yea further, as he doth in his Sermon on Justification, to look upon it, as a Misfortune to differ from the Church of *England*, and upon the Matter excommunicate such as upon a Conviction, scruple Fellowship with them, in their corrupt Worship; discovers such a Time-serving, and Man-pleasing Humour, as is so very inconsistent the one with the other, that whatever be the Apologist's Opinion of his Saintship, he cannot according to our Principles, purge him of Scandal, and therefore not to be held Communion with: A Saint may be justly excommunicated; a Minister, whose Saintship we may not deny, may be justly deposed and excommunicated; in which Situation, we are not to hold Communion with him in Worship; but if the Argument from the *Westminster* Confession be understood of Saints, without Exception or Limitation, I ought to hold Communion with him.

I cannot tell, if Mr. *Whitefield* be excommunicated by his own Church of *England* by any formal Process or not; but I am certain, he is under that Sentence, according to their *ipso facto* Excommunications, if he hath honestly renounced the Supremacy, not that I am justifying those *ipso facto* Excommunications, but they may be justly pleaded against him, who at *Fetter-Lane* Society declared against them at *Oxford*, who were scrupling the Habits and Ceremonies.

If a holy Man of a Minister, should hold some dangerous Error, own and maintain it, tho' when he is on the North-side of *Tweed*, he doth not preach it, but holds forth on it on the South-side of *Tweed*: Should I hold Communion with such an One? Or should such an One be invited to *Scotland*, to cure us of narrow Ways of thinking? If I am not to do it upon the Account of Doctrine, as little am I to do it on the Account of Worship. Tho' Mr *Whitefield* do not practise their corrupt Worship in *Scotland*, is he not an Offender when he practises and maintains it in *England*? Doth he hold the Doctrine of Christ who adheres to the Episcopal Hierarchy, or who preaches an Indifferency, about the Government of Christ's House?

Now

Now let him be a Saint, if I am to run after the Ministry of such a Man, tho' for now or then, he finds it expedient to act otherwise, let the Apologist say, that this is the meaning of the *Westminster* Confession, and we will know what to answer; but till he say that this is the meaning of the *Westminster* Confession, he hath said nothing from it, to justify the Hearing of Mr. *Whitefield*.

What I have said, for understanding the Article in the Confession, with a necessary Limitation, is justified by the Apologist himself, when applied to defend the Hearing of Mr. *Whitefield*, Page 39. "But in the Case of a Person guilty of Immoralities, or otherwise sinning wilfully against his Light, we are bound by the Texts abovesited to withdraw from such, that he may be ashamed; and if he persists in such wilful sinning, he becomes the Object of Church Censure, even to Excommunication.

If I have failed in commenting upon the Confession, I thank the Apologist for helping me at a dead Lift. Now let me ask him, Doth not Mr. *Whitefield* sin against Light, and persists wilfully in this Sin, and so becomes an Object of Censure, when he hath p. 11. openly declared his Belief, that our Presbyterian Church (whatever were his former Sentiments,) is the best constitute national Church on Earth, and yet at the same Time holds fast his Episcopacy, and chooses to live and dy in the Communion of the Church of *England*, as may be seen in his adopted Extract; and this is not only his own Purpose, but it is his Endeavour, that none of his praying Societies separate from the Church of *England*, as is to be seen in Pages 6. 10. of his Letter to them, "If ever such Designs should be set on Foot, I earnestly pray God, the Abettors of them may be detected, and all their Schemes, tho' never so plausibly corrected, fall to the Ground."

The Apologist to strengthen his Argument, says, Page 37, 38. 39. "That how soon we are satisfied of the Reality of each other's Christianity, we ought to hold Communion in the Worship of God together,

“ ther, so far as we are agreed; and wherein we differ
 “ in Points not inconsistent with Christianity, we are
 “ within the Case of that Text,” *Phil. iii. 15. 16.*
*Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded,
 and if in any Thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall
 reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we
 have already attained, let us walk by the same Rule, let
 us mind the same Thing.*

The Apologist will remember, that the Communion we are upon, is the Communion that is between Pastor and People, he preaching, and they hearing; If then I must hold this Communion with him in all Things wherein we are agreed; how soon I am satisfied of his Christianity, our Sufferers in the last Episcopal Period, should have heard such of the Episcopal Clergy, as the Apologist allows. Page 3. to have been good Men, and to have preached Calvinistical Doctrine; for as I have noticed before, they had never heard of the Act of Parliament 1663. if they had not scrupled to hear them, and to concur with them. According to this Doctrine, if the Apologist were in *England*, if he have any Exception against the *English* Forms, he would not go to Church, till these were expedie, but then forthwith to Church, to hear the Sermon; I should not think this edifying, nor agreeable to Gospel Order; to hear where I could not join in Prayer. Yea were he in *France*, I believe he would not join in the Popish Worship, but according to his Principles, he behooved to go and hear such a Man as Father *Quesnel*, or a *Jansenist* Priest, who might entertain him with a good orthodox Sermon.

If he say, the Cases are not parallel to our hearing Mr. *Whitefield*; when we hear him, we can join with him, both in Prayer and Preaching. This hath been already noticed, only let me add, by asking the Apologist two Questions; were he in *England*, and saw Mr. *Whitefield* in his Surplice, reading Prayers in his Desk, would he join with him either in the Prayers, or staying out, till he be divested of his Death-like Robe, suitable enough for such dead Prayers, would he after-

wards go in, and hear his Sermon? Or were a *Trans-
nist* Priest in *Scotland*, praying and preaching without
his Popish Forms; would he go and hear him? I hope
he will not deny but some such may be real Christians;
at least Protestant Divines, after due Cautions laid
down, will allow this. If he say, he would not, he
breaks his own Rule of holding Communion in Wor-
ship with every real Christian, so far as we are agreed.
I know some of Mr. *Whitefield's* blind Followers have
said, that they should go and hear a Popish Priest, if
he would preach like him; yet after all that the Apo-
logist hath said in his mistaken Principle, I will not
believe, that he would be a Hearer of a Popish Priest;
even tho' he preached like Mr. *Whitefield*. If he, and
some of my old Acquaintances, would assure the Soci-
ety *de propaganda fide*, of this, I am confident, they
would very frankly accommodate them with such Mis-
sionaries, to reclaim them from their narrow Ways of
thinking; or I should rather have said, to confirm
them in their late taken-up latitudinarian Principles.
These designing Men could make a good Harvest by
such Measures.

Now, I come to speak to *Phil. iii. 15. 16.* adduced
by the Apologist and others, whose Province it is to
expound the Scripture, (I suppose the Apologist bears
not that Character,) to prove this now so much prevail-
ing Principle, of holding outward Church Communi-
on with all that fear God, in all Things wherein they
are agreed; but what Branch of this Scripture proves
that Principle, I am at the greatest Loss to find out;
it cannot be, *as many as be perfect, be thus minded;*
nor can it be, *whereto we have already attained, let*
us walk by the same Rule; let us mind the same Thing;
this will speak against the beloved Principle. The
Argument must be in the Words, *If in any Thing ye*
be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.

The Patrons of Toleration swagger with this Scrip-
ture, as if it did bear them out in their Argument; but
it is new to me, to hear it pleaded for defending of such
a loose Principle, as that of the Apologist, and other

Followers of Mr. *Whitefield*. These two Verses must be understood as they stand in Connection with the former Part of the Chapter, in which, the Apostle disclaims all glorying in the *Jewish* Religion, and expresses his Confidence in Christ Jesus, *Counting all but Loss, and Dung for him; and presses towards the Mark, as not having yet attained*; then he exhorts them that are perfect, that are rightly instructed, to shew themselves thus minded, and having attained to the same Knowledge with him, to walk by the same Rule, and to mind the same Thing; if in any Thing ye be otherwise minded, that is, entertain any Principle different from this, God shall reveal this to you; he will justify my Doctrine by convincing you of its Truth. If the Apostle meant that we should hold a promiscuous Communion with them that were otherwise minded, he should prove our holding Communion with them, that betake themselves to another Ground of Hope, than the Righteousness of Christ. It is not to be said, that the Apostle means a differing about other Things, but agreeing in this necessary Doctrine; for I think it is obvious to any unbiassed Observer, that the Difference he speaks of, is a Difference about the Doctrine he had been upon; *If in any Thing ye be otherwise minded*, if ye think otherwise, or different from this, God shall reveal even this unto you. If the Difference had been about any other Thing, the Words had been, God will reveal even that unto you, and not this unto you; for the Word *this*, confines his meaning to the Doctrine in Hand; so that it a glossing away the Apostle's Words, to say, that he pleads for a promiscuous Communion with all that in any Thing differ from us, providing they be right as to Christ our Righteousness; there is no such Thing in the Text; for the Words, *God shall reveal this unto you*, do not at all imply this; although the Things of Difference, were other Matters than the Doctrine he had written of; and tho' the Difference should be meant of other Things, I think we are forbidden to walk with such, when he says, *whereunto we have*

have already attained let us walk by the same Rule, let us find the same Thing ; it cannot be, let every one follow his Opinion, and let every one hold Communion together, under all our Diversity of Opinions, not inconsistent with the holding Christ as our Righteousness, because of what follows, *Ver. 17. Brethren be Followers together of me, and mark them which walk so, as ye have us for an Example.* And as I have said before, what proves too much proves nothing : If we take the Apologist, and his Adherents, their Gloss on this Scripture ; we are warranted to hold Fellowship with Mr. *Whitefield*, or any *English* Priest, in their corrupt, and formal Worship ; for since I do not, I hope the Apologist will not say, that their Worship is inconsistent with their holding Christ our Righteousness, or with their having the Truth and Reality of Christianity. Thus I have considered their Scripture Argument, in what I think is the proper meaning of it, and in that, as contrary to the Apologist ; or even supposing his own Gloss, it drives him into a Practice, he hath not yet undertaken to justify, namely, the joining in the corrupt, and formal Worship of the Church of *England* ; because many who practise that Worship, are real Christians.

Before I have done with his Argument from the *Westminster* Confession, let me put him in Remembrance of a Clause in his quoted Article, restricting the Sense and meaning, of how far I am to hold Fellowship with all professed Saints, in the Worship of God, *viz.* “ as tends to mutual Edification,” that is, if it be not to mutual Edification, to hold Communion in Worship, with all professed Saints, I am not to hold it. Now let us try what Use may be made of the Article so limited, in Reference to the Subject in Hand. If my holding outward Church Communion with any Minister, a professed Saint, holding Error, or Errors, puts me in Hazard of being led insensibly in to a Liking to his Error, or Errors ; or if my holding such Communion with him, doth tend to flatter, or harden him in his Error, or Errors ; can it be pretended, that such Communion

munion is for mutual Edification ? I think, I may boldly say, it is not. The Apologist allows Episcopacy to be an Error, he cannot deny Mr. *Whitefield's* holding this Error ; and p. 8. he tells us " that the Curates " who were sonnd in their Doctrine, and regular in " their Lives, reconciled their Parishes, to hear them, " and in Time brought them to a Liking to Episcopacy it self." Apply this to the Apologist, and other Hearers of Mr. *Whitefield* ; his alledged Soundness and Saintship, hath reconciled them to hear him ; and how far they are on the Road of being reconciled to Episcopacy it self, I refer to the Apologist's Plea, that Mr. *Whitefield's* Episcopacy and Supremacy, are not Reasons against hearing him ; and with Respect to Mr. *Whitefield*, doth it not tend to harden him, in his Episcopal Error, that he is so caressed, and countenanced by professed Presbyterians ? Upon the whole then, where is the mutual Edification in hearing, and countenancing him, who thereby is encouraged to hold an Error, and the Hearers, are in such Hazard of being led into the Error, when they are already become so indifferent about it ? And if mutual Edification cannot be reached by the Practice, where is the Force of the Argument, taken from the Article of the *Westminster* Confession of Faith ?

Furthermore, if the ordering and governing of the Church, was a Part of the Apostles Doctrine, which I hope, the Apologist will not deny, if he should, he would but expose himself, then the outward Church Communion mentioned in the Article of our Confession, is such an outward Communion, as consists with an abiding in the Apostles Doctrine, and thus I argue, as for other Reasons, so for this, that our *Westminster* Divines have annexed that Scripture, *Acts* ii. 42. for proving and explaining their Doctrine, laid down in the quoted Article ; *And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, and Fellowship.* Admit once the Order and Government of Christ's House, to be laid down in the New Testament ; it behooved to be a Part of the Apostles Doctrine, which being, they could not

be said, to continue in the Apostles Doctrine, who would have declared themselves resolved to live and die in such a Communion, and Society as held another Order, and Government.

I allow, that all have not the same Knowledge, and Discerning, and I shall as readily as any Man grant, that it is not every Difference that is to disjoin Church Members ; but among the many Debates of this Day, about outward Church Communion and Separation ; I think humbly, that it might be of great Use to clear and shorten the Debate, to observe this Rule : That since here, we are in an imperfect State, and know but in Part, it is not every Difference of thinking, that ought to interrupt outward Church Communion, else, I am afraid, there should be none in the imperfect State ; but for holding this Communion, there must be Principles of Union, therefore whosoever violates all, or one, or other, of the Principles of Union, and continues to defend such a Deed, or Deeds, he is the Separatist, departing from the Center of Union, Truth ; and from him, we ought to withdraw, he continueth not in the Apostles Doctrine. Now if the Apologist will allow, the Government of Christ's House, to be Presbyterian ; and this to be a Part of the Apostles Doctrine, and this Government, and Discipline, to be one of the Marks of the true Church ; as is maintained by Protestant Confessionists and Divines ; if he will allow, the Holding the Government of Christ's House to be a Bond of Union in a visible Church Society ; then, the Minister who holds, approves, and maintains another Government, as Mr. *Whitefield* doth, he transgresseth upon this Bond of Union, and ought to be withdrawn from. I wish the worthy Ministers of the Associate Presbytery, (whom, so far as I am acquainted with them, I own for the Servants of Jesus Christ, witnessing for his Cause,) would state the Matter thus, that would prevent their running into some Extremes, which I am grieved for, and which in the Issue I am afraid, shall produce Inconveniencies, they are not yet aware of.

This may balance what the Apologist writes. p. 39, of being of one Opinion in all Things, while in an imperfect State, and I think it needful, for him, and me, in such a Reeling, and mistaking Time, to caution strongly, and not to lay down loose, and general Assertions, which may be interpreted, beyond his, or my Intention.

From what hath been offered, I think the Apologist extends his outward Church Communion, beyond what hath, that I know of, been yet his own Practice, or would be his Practice, were Occasions offering; when he extends it, to all who hold no Principle inconsistent with the Reality of being a Christian. It is true, p. 39. he limits this Principle by Differences in lesser Matters; but what are his lesser Matters, and how far his outward Church-communion extends, he shews us P. 36, "Separating other Crimes, we find Supremacy and "Episcopacy, no sufficient Ground, to refuse a Man's "Ministry, otherwise unexceptionable." This he acknowledges to have been the Practice, in the first Episcopal Period, which hath already been largely noticed; but as hath been observed, this was not till now, in the Case of Mr. *Whitefield*, the Practice since the Revolution; since which Time, there was no subsisting Reason, for refusing the Ministry of severals, but their Episcopacy, for the Supremacy was abrogated, and the Episcopalians then in Churches, had never personally sworn the Covenants. I am sorry the Apologist hath been at so much Pains, to reduce us, to a Liking of Episcopacy; especially when so much of it doth prevail, and Presbytery is so much on the Decline; and when a Testimony for the much neglected Government of the Lord's House, is so necessary, and so many are looking on that, as a trifling indifferent Matter; which to use the Apologist's own Words, p. 15. 16. "were it a "small Matter, it becomes great, when a Testimony is "concerned in it, were it but an open Window, as in "the Case of *Daniel*."

I know, the Apologist will readily say, that we are in no Hazard this Way from Mr. *Whitefield*, by our hearing

hearing and countenancing his Ministry, since, as p. 15. "his great Business among us, is to reconcile us to our God, to our Ministers, and to one another in Love."

I think, the Apologist should have said, neither are we in Hazard this Way, by Apologies offered for professed Presbyterians, their embracing his Ministry, even tho' it be defended now, as no Reason for refusing a Man's Ministry, because of the Episcopacy and Supremacy; than which, I know not what hath a more direct Tendency to lead us in to a Liking to Episcopacy, and to Indifferency about Presbytery; and consequently, to a giving up with Presbytery; which appears too evident to be the Case in this Church and Land, and much upon the Advance.

But what Necessity of calling in Mr. *Whitefield*, to preach the Doctrine of Reconciliation to you? Do not your own Ministers that? If they do not that, Mr. *Whitefield* doth wrong, to reconcile you to such Ministers: But whatever just Cause there is of Complaint, that corrupt Doctrine, and a corrupt Ministry doth prevail; there are yet many Ministers in *Scotland*, who preach the Doctrine of Reconciliation, and far beyond Mr. *Whitefield*, who hath preached and printed, with such corrupt Mixtures, that he had need to be taught by such.

As to his reconciling you to your Ministers; how doth he that? By teaching you, not to contend about the Government of Christ's House, which you may go to Heaven without; at the same Time, he p. 3. paps out in his printed Performances, now and then Bemoanings over them, who have the Unhappiness, to differ from the Church of *England*; and prays, "that she may be the Joy of the whole Earth," and resolves to live and die in her Communion, and would have us speak softly of them who use read Forms in the Worship of God. So that his reconciling you to your Ministers, appears not to be to those Ministers, who are maintaing the run down Cause of the Church of *Scotland*, but to them, who are declining so fast, from

the Purity of our Reformation. For tho' sundry of the Ministers in *Scotland*, that are Followers of Mr. *Whitefield*, do preach the Doctrine of Reconciliation, they are so much leavened with Mr. *Whitefield's* loose Way of Preaching, and Writing about the Government of Christ's House; that it may make those whom they formerly looked on as lax on that Head, now to laugh at them, when others, I believe, are weeping in secret, at the Greatness of their Defection.

As for his reconciling us to one another, let the Fruits of Mr. *Whitefield's* trafficking in *Scotland*, explain this. It is evident to any unbiaſſed Observer, that if any Minister, or private Christians, but maintain their old presbyterian Principles, and caution their Hearers, and Neighbours, against the Looseness of Mr. *Whitefield's*, his Followers breathe forth such a malignant Spirit, as that they cannot keep in common Terms of Discretion with their Ministers, and honest Neighbours; and instead of reconciling People to their Ministers, and to one another, they are disaffected to Ministers, who preach the Doctrine of Reconciliation, and maintain their Principles, and look with a jealous and invidious Eye on their Neighbours, if they countenance such.

Sir, it is more than Time, that I should draw to a Conclusion of this Missive, the Length of which hath exceeded far my Design, when I began to write you; but lest you charge me on Breach of my Promise, to take Notice of the Apologist's third Reason, why our Sufferers in the last Episcopal Period did not hear the Curates, I proceed now to it, as you have it p. 12. the Substance of which turns upon the Immorality of the Curates Lives, and the Unsoundness of their Doctrine; and since these Things cannot be alledged against Mr. *Whitefield*, they cannot be a Reason against Presbyterians hearing him, as the Apologist pleads.

But admitting both these were true, there are Abundance of Reasons besides, that the embracing of his Ministry, as the Matter is stated by the Apologist, is not to be justified, by any real Presbyterian.

Especially, if Mr *Whitefield's* own printed Performances gives Discoveries of Enthusiasm daring Presumption, and popish Superstition in his Religion; Unsoundness, and Inconsistency, in his Doctrine; Immorality, and Irregularity in his Life, and Conduct. You see, I state these Things, in a Way of Supposition; and if there be no Ground for them, from his printed Performances, let his Orthodoxy, and moral Character, stand fair for me; but if his own Words, and Deeds, recorded in his Prints, bring forth more than presumptive Evidence against him, the Apologist will find him casten by the Reason our Forefathers had against hearing the Curates: Should there be but a presumptive Evidence, he stands rejected by the Apostle, 1 *Tim. 3, 2, 7. A Bishop must be blameless, and have a good Report of them who are without.*

If I had seen sundry of his Performances, which I find have come under the Survey of abler Hands, I might make a very large Collection of many Things, that look very unfavourably upon Mr. *Whitefield's* Religion, Orthodoxy, and moral Character; but I must abridge much of what I might offer, being long since wearied of the Subject.

When I say, that his own printed Performances, represent him, in his Religion, and religious Experiences, as enthusiastical, daringly presumptuous, and popishly superstitious, I hope, he shall not have the Advantage against me, which he hath against a Prelate of his own Church; he shall not find me quarrelling, as enthusiastical, the insuperable Work of the Spirit of God, in the Regeneration and Conversion of a Sinner, or the precious Doctrine of Justification freely, by Grace, through the Faith of Christ, as the Lord our Righteousness; I wish that Mr. *Whitefield's* Sermons had nothing in them, inconsistent with these Truths.

I am not to undertake a tedious Dispute on the Head of Enthusiasm, but I may adventure to give this Description of it; which may explain it to very mean Capacities; that it is a strong and fervent religious like

Impression upon a Person, without any Thing of Reason or Revelation, to account for it, or to support it. From which Description, or Definition, we may see, that we are not to call every one an Enthusiast, who may be wrong in his Principles; or who uses mistaken Arguments to explain, and maintain them; because these Reasons appear good to him, and he doth not assert, or maintain any Thing merely, because he is warmly impressed with it, but pleads his Reasons, such as they are, for it.

If Mr. *Whitefield*, in the Account of God's dealings with his Soul, or in any other of his printed Performances, can purge himself of Enthusiasm, as I have described it. I shall not charge it upon him, merely because of mistaken Principles, maintained by unconcluding Arguments,

It is not in my Power to know, when, or by what Means, Mr. *Whitefield* was converted, for all the regular Method he pretends to lay down in accounting of it. I find him, p. 10. of the *Edinburgh* Impression of the Account of God's Dealings with his Soul, enjoying great Foretastes of God's Love, and once in Saint *John's* Church, filled with unspeakable Raptures, that says he, I was carried out beyond my self; and p. 11. tho' I had tasted of his Love, my Heart was far from him. Now how knew he that this was the Love of God? Since all this Time unconverted, and that the carnal Mind is Enmity against God? How could this be the Love of God, that was in him? Or if it was the Flashes, that may be with a temporary Believer, by what Means came they? Will it satisfy, to tell the World, that he felt it, and yet give no Account of the Means?

P. 15. He tells us, " That for a twelve Month, he " went on in a Round of Duties, receiving the Sacra- " ment monthly, fasting frequently, &c. p. 16. and " when he was at the University, he found the Benefit " of the Foundation he had laid in the Country for a " holy Life, and yet p. 18. he tells us, that till that " Treatise, the Life of God in the Soul of Man, fell " into

“ into his Hand, he never knew what true Religion was, and that he must be a new Creature.” Mr. *Whitefield* indeed appears to have his conversional Experiences formed much on that Book, which speaks of being exercised to Godliness in Order to our being Partakers of the new Nature.

P. 22. How knew he, or how could it be, that it was the Favour of God, that lifted him up with sensible Devotion, especially at the blessed Sacrament, before Religion took Root in his Heart? What was the Nature of his sensible Devotion and Upliftings, before he was convinced, that he behoooved to be renewed, e’re he could see God?

From p. 24. to 33. we find him, with an inward Weight on his Breast, attended with inward Darkness, feeling great Heavings in his Body, that he was fully convinced, that Satan had as real Possession and Power over his Body, as he had once over *Job*’s. (Mr. *Whitefield* should have distinguished between the Power Satan got to afflict *Job*’s Body, and Satan’s possessing his Body,) to such a Degree of Influence, that p. 28. his Tutor concluded, he was mad; he continues long in this Condition, mixing his popish Customs p. 28. with Duties of Religion; and notwithstanding of his Darkness, and Possession by Satan, p. 30. he continues receiving the Sacrament, p. 31. finding Grace in an affecting Manner, and abundant Measure, sometimes imparted to his Soul; tho’ all this while, I hope he doth not pretend to be converted, because after this Time of Tentation, he says, p. 33. “ The Star which I had seen at a Distance before, began to appear again, and the Day Star arose in my Heart. Now did the Spirit of God take Possession of my Soul, and as I humbly hope, seal me unto the Day of Redemption.” Had he been converted before; to be sure the Spirit had taken Possession of his Soul.

Let us take a View of the enthusiastick Account of his Outgate from his Distress, and the Grounds of his Joy and Gladness, P. 33. “ One Day perceiving an uncommon Drought, and a disagreeable clamminess

“ nefs in my Mouth, and using Things to allay my
 “ Thirst, it was suggested to me, that when Jesus
 “ Christ cried out, I thirst, his Sufferings were near at
 “ an End. Upon which I cast my self down on my
 “ Bed, crying out, I thirst, I thirst. Soon after this,
 “ I found and felt in my self, that I was delivered
 “ from the Burden, that had so heavily oppressed me.
 “ The Spirit of mourning was taken from me, and I
 “ knew what it was truly to rejoice in God my Savi-
 “ our, and for some Time could not avoid singing
 “ Psalms wherever I was.” Of his Account, this looks
 the likest to Satan’s casting out Satan, as Page 25, that
 can be; he gets free of bodily Distress; upon this, he
 hath Joy and Gladness; speaks he one Word of get-
 ting free from the Bondage of Corruption, in this re-
 markable Deliverance? It is true, he mentions Joy,
 and speaks of the Days of his Mourning being ended;
 but what was the Ground of his Joy? He speaks of
 rejoicing in God his Saviour; but from what Experi-
 ence suitable to the Word, did he fetch this Joy? or
 on what Revelation of Jesus Christ suitable to his Case,
 since it is not till sometime hereafter, Page 37. 38,
 that he is instructed in the Knowledge of the necessity
 of Justification by Faith only? He felt Joy, and he
 can give no other Account of it, but he felt it; he is
 sure he hath got the Spirit of Adoption, but alas, it
 is before he is instructed in the Knowledge of Justifica-
 tion by Faith alone. He sometimes speaks confusedly
 of Heart Evils, as Page 32, but gives he any solid
 scriptural Account of his Deliverance from these? He
 gets free of his bodily Pressure, and finds a Rapture of
 Joy, and therefore concludes that the Spirit of God
 had taken Possession of his Soul.

If Mr. *Whitefield*’s Votaries will date his Conversion,
 from what he says, Page 19. that upon reading (that
 Arminian Book, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*),
 “ a Ray of divine Light was instantaneously darted in
 “ upon my Soul, and from that Moment, and not till
 “ then, did I know that I must be a new Creature.”
 If then he was made a new Creature, then the Spirit
 of

of God had taken Possession of him, but this he asserts not, till his Deliverance in Page 33.

His blind enthusiastical Proceeding in his religious Matters, doth further manifest it self, by his daring, and presumptuous Expressions and Assertions, concerning himself; of which, I shall only stay to give you some Instances.

It is the Duty of every true Christian, to be a Follower of Christ; but Presumption, to pretend to be like him in every Circumstance of his Sufferings. Tho' Christ was born in a Manger, his Mother being from her own Home; that gave Mr. *Whitefield* no Likeness to his Saviour, Page 5. that he the Son of an Inn-keeper, was born in an Inn; the Children of such, are not always the likest to their Saviour. I know no Argument for influencing a religious Life, that can be drawn from being an Inn-keeper's Son, more than can be drawn from occupying the Trade of a Carpenter, because our Lord wrought in that Business, *Mark* 6. 3.

How presumptuous and mistaken is Mr. *Whitefield's* Conclusion, "That God loved him with an everlasting Love, Page 7. and separated him from his Mother's Womb, for the Work to which he afterwards called him, because he found early Movings of the Spirit on his Heart?" Have not many had strong common Motions of the Spirit on their Hearts, that never were converted? And others, tho' afterwards converted, were never called to the Work of the Ministry.

While the Holy Spirit had not yet taken Possession of his Soul, as Page 33. how delusive and presumptuous for him to say, "that he grew in Favour with God and Man?" He is always fond to arrogate to himself some great Thing spoken of our Saviour, not the likeliest Way of following him in his Humility, as he pretends, Page 24. But how could he grow in Favour with God, who was not yet reconciled? Or how could he be sure of this, who to use his own Words, Page 33. "had seen the Star but at a Distance, and before the Day Star arose in his Heart."

Because

Because Page 29. Mr. *Whitefield* did choofe a folitary Walk, how presumptuous for him to pretend thereby to imitate Chrift, who was among wild Beasts when tempted? Or had there been something in his Practice like that State our Lord was in, when driven into the Wildernefs, to be tempted of the Devil; was it his Duty to have made a voluntary Choice of Temptation? Whence could this be fuggested to him? Not furely from the Spirit of Chrift, nor from any Principle of folid Reason that can be pretended.

Time fhould fail me, to run through, and to Remark upon all the odd, and presumptuous Things, that are in the Account of God's Dealings with his Soul; but let me mention one Instance more, Page 38. "The holy Spirit from Time to Time, has led me "into the Knowledge of divine Things, and I have "been directed by watching and reading the Scripture "in this Manner, even in the minuteft Circumftances, "as plainly as the *Jews* were, when confulting "the Urim and Thummim at the high Prieft's "Breast."

I wifh Mr. *Whitefield* believed and held as I do, the Scriptures to be the only Rule of Faith and Manners; but yet I do not fay, that the Scriptures were defigned to be a Rule in the minuteft Circumftances, no not in the minuteft Circumftances of divine Things. I choofe rather to fpeak in the Words of the excellent *Westminster* Confeflion, Chap. 1. Sect 6. "There are "some Circumftances concerning the Worfhip of God, "and Government of the Church, common to human Actions and Societies, which are to be ordered "by the Light of Nature, and christian Prudence, "according to the general Rules of the Word; which "are always to be obferved." Now if Mr. *Whitefield* could fay no more to my felf, for proving the twentieth Article, concerning Rites and Ceremonies from the Word, but let all Things be done decently and in Order, as he hath failed to prove the thirty nine Articles by the Scripture, as Page 44. of the former Book of his, fo is he far from proving the minuteft Circumftances,

stances, for let Rites and Ceremonies of Man's Appointment be but Circumstances, he can adduce no Scripture for these Circumstances, but since they are a Part of Worship, he fails notoriously in his Proof; tho' he glaringly pretends to be led on by the Spirit in the minutest Circumstances, and as plainly as the *Jews* were, when consulting the Urim and Thummim. But what need I mention the Article about Rites, and Ceremonies, when, notwithstanding of this pretended Measure of the Spirit, he hath preached and printed so much unsound Doctrine, that in answer to some Queries put to him in *Pennsylvania*, he professes a Retraction of some Points; there had been no need of such Retractions, if the Spirit had as plainly led and directed him in the Knowledge of divine Things, as the *Jews* were, when consulting the Urim and Thummim. I shall not in my Allowances, go straitly to Work with Mr. *Whitefield*, I shall allow him all the Improvements and Measures to which he hath presently attained, and the Advantage of all his Convictions and Retractions; w^{ill} he say, that he is as plainly guided, and certainly instructed as yet in the Measures he takes, as the *Jews* were, when consulting the Urim and Thummim, by which God gave a present Revelation of his Mind and Will to that People? And tho' the Scriptures are a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners, yet considering our Ignorance in the imperfect State, and how liable we are to mistake that Rule, will Mr. *Whitefield* pretend to understand the Mind of God in the Scriptures, as plainly and certainly, as the *Jews* did the extraordinary Revelation by Urim and Thummim? His Pretensions to this, discover a Spirit of Delusion.

How daring and presumptuous is it for Mr. *Whitefield* to say, as he doth in his Journal, Feb. 4. 1739.

"Now I know that I received the Holy Ghost at the
"Imposition of Hands, for I feel it as much as *Elisba*
"did when *Elijah* dropped his Mantle, nay others see
"it also.

Since Mr. *Whitefield* hath not thought fit to give any Answer to many of the Questions put to him in

Pensilvania, I shall here transcribe two of them, that remain unanswered.

1. Whether the giving of the Holy Ghost by the Imposition of Hands, was not an extraordinary Gift, and now long ago ceased?

2. Can any suppose, that the extraordinary Gifts and Operations of God's Spirit, are so sensibly felt, or carry with them so clear a Demonstration, as the extraordinary ones did to the Prophets? Or how could Mr. *Whitefield* compare his feeling to *Elisba*? To which, let me add.

3. How could others know, that Mr. *Whitefield* had received such a Measure of the Spirit, by the laying on of the Hands of the Bishop? Are we to believe, (tho' in ordaining Priests, the Bishop says, receive the Holy Ghost,) that the Holy Ghost is given by the Imposition of his Hands; especially in such a Measure, as was bestowed on *Elisba*?

4. Altho' *Elisba* endued with the sanctifying Spirit, was not to pretend to Perfection in Holiness, but was a Man of like Passions, even as others; was he not endued with the Spirit in such a Measure, as to be preserved from Error in his prophetical Commission? If so, how foolish and presumptuous is it in Mr. *Whitefield*, to tell the World, that he felt the Holy Ghost as much as *Elisba* did, when *Elijah* dropped his Mantle; when yet, after such an extraordinary Receipt, he goes so miserably wrong in executing his ministerial Commission; and preaches so very much unsound Doctrine?

He goes on with his bold presumptuous Words, in his Farewel Sermon at *Edinburgh*, October 1741. And in his Letter to Mr. *Cennick*, Number 31. of his weekly History, he says, "the Presence of God at the old People's Hospital, was really very wonderful, the Holy Ghost came down like a mighty rushing Wind." We read of the like, *Acts* ii. 2. upon the extraordinary Effusion of the Spirit; but as his Evidences come short in all respects of that Manifestation, it must be added to the Number of his blind and daring Assertions.

Affertions, of which, he is not like to be easily cured; the Disease grows upon him, a small Volume might be requisite for illuminating his Character in this one Point alone; and therefore I shall proceed with one Instance more from his Letter, dated *Edinburgh, June 4th 1742.* to his dear Brother *Abbot*, "As soon as I " was on Shore, the Holy Spirit filled my Soul." Going to see some Persons, he says, "The Holy Ghost " overshadowed us." *Luke i. 35.* shews on what Oc-
 casion, that Expression was used. Mr. *Whitefield* speaks confidently of extraordinary Measures of the Spirit in others, as well as in himself, but what are the extraor-
 dinary Effects? Work they Miracles? Speak they with Tongues? If a Hush of Attention in hearing a moving Discourse were Warrant to say, That the Spi-
 rit came down like the rushing of a mighty Wind, yea, add some Emotion among the People, many Mi-
 nisters might have pretended such Things, before Mr. *Whitefield* was heard tell of; but we have not so learn-
 ed Christ, nor dare we speak in such a presumptuous Manner of the Operations of the Holy Ghost.

But whatever be the Measure of the Spirit bestowed on him, or whatever be the Spirit, by which he is led, we find him in the Account of God's Dealings with his Soul, Popishly Superstitious; and no Wonder, considering how much he hath dealt with popish Au-
 thors, who, I am afraid are but too dear to him, and his Commendations of them, are too strong; not to beget a Suspicion.

As for his holy Season of *Lent*, p. 32. and the Ob-
 servation thereof, I shall not stay to shew, how much the Church of *England* and he, do symbolise with Pa-
 pists in that and other Things; but I am yet to be in-
 structed in it, if ever the Church of *England* taught, that such *Popish* Pennances, as a patched Gown and
 dirty Shoes, were Means to promote the spiritual Life, as Mr. *Whitefield* says, p. 26. they were to him, altho' he tells us, "I was convinced that the Kingdom of
 " God did not consist in Meats and Drinks, yet I re-
 " solutely persisted in these voluntary Acts of Self-de-
 " nial."

“ nial.” Sure I am, the Means for promoting the spiritual Life, do belong to the Kingdom of God ; tho’ I frankly own that a patched Gown and dirty Shoes, do not, nor are Means in any Respect, for promoting the Spiritual Life ; but I leave him to be directed as to the Means of the Spiritual Life, to *Kempis*, and *Castaniza*, his darling Authors. But this insensible Way of introducing *Papish* Pennances and Customs, do add to the Suspicion of his being a *Romish* Emissary, and that the Methodists are carrying on the Designs of *Rome* ; which Suspicion will not be removed, tho’ many of them should not know so much ; for whoever pleases to consult the secret Instructions of the Jesuites, printed at *London* 1723. will find it a Knack of that subtle Body to employ Instruments in such a Way ; and it hath been observed of Mr. *Whitefield*, that tho’ now and then, he gives a blind Scream against other Hereticks, and erroneous Persons, the *Papists* come seldom in his Way, tho’ since they much prevail, it is needful to take much Notice of them.

But next, let us see what is to be said to the Unsoundness and Inconsistency of Mr. *Whitefield*’s Doctrine. I shall not offend him nor his Friends, by calling his whole Doctrine diabolical ; yet it will not entitle him to the Character of a Preacher of the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, that he preaches many precious Truths. *Papists* and very gross Hereticks do that, and some of the worst of Books, have yet some excellent Stroaks in them ; yea it is the Art of the old Serpent, who can transform himself into an Angel of Light, to lay some dangerous Error beside some precious Truth, that the one may not be suspected in the Neighbourhood of the other ; by which Means, there are too many that take all in a Lump, by not espying the Snake in the Grass ; nor suspecting Danger at their Hands, who appear zealous for some Points of Truth, who, before they are aware, are taken off their Feet.

Altho’ Mr. *Whitefield* pretended to my self, after he had heard me preach against sundry of his Errors, that if I had seen his Answers to the *Pensilvanian* Queries, containing

contain
in his
him ;
since I
find hi
ed aga
Satisf
but a
and f
contain
ed in
shown
conde
Incon
Th
field f
“ Per
his C
“ wa
“ fe
still,
For i
fectio
his C
reate
Perfe
M
Men
on th
rent
“ M
“ pu
“ li
“ th
“ m
depe
shel
ther
depe
Part

containing his retracting what was alledged to be wrong in his Doctrine, I would not have preached so against him ; yet now, that it is some considerable Time, since I have read his Answers to these Queries, I neither find him answering all that was on just Grounds excepted against him, nor in all wherein he answers, giving Satisfaction either by his Answers, or after Practice ; but as there are sundry Things of Importance, then, and since, exceptionable in his Doctrine, that are not contained, yea in some Instances could not be contained in the *Pennsylvanian* Remarks, I shall after I have shown the Unsatisfactoriness of his Answers to these, condescend upon other Instances of the Unsoundness, and Inconsistency of his Doctrine, and Principles.

The *Pennsylvanian* Querists, justly quarrel Mr. *Whitefield* for saying, “ That *Adam* was adorned with all the “ Perfections of the Deity.” Altho’ they justly allow his Correction to be less exceptionable, *viz.* “ That he “ was adorned with all the moral communicable Perfections of the Deity.” But they as justly query still, if this Correction may not be further corrected ? For is it not evident, that even the communicable Perfections of the Deity, are not properly communicated to his Creatures ; for what is there in the Creature but a created Quality, that bears a dark Resemblance of those Perfections, which in God are Essential ?

Mr. *Whitefield* having corrected what he had said, of Men’s depending on their own Righteousness, and not on the Righteousness of Christ, imputed to, and inherent in them, thus ; “ I would express myself in this “ Manner, who have neither Christ’s Righteousness imputed to them for Justification in the Sight, nor Holiness wrought in their Souls, as the Consequence of that, in Order to make them meet for the Enjoyment of God.” The Querists justly reply, that to depend on Christ’s Righteousness inherent in us, smells of rank Antinomianism : If it shall be said, there was no more intended than inherent Holiness ; to depend on this in Part, and on Christ’s Righteousness in Part, would be true Arminian or popish Dialect ; and therefore

therefore deserved at Mr. *Whitefield's* Hand, as black a Stroke of false Divinity, to be put upon it, as what he had preached before of joining our Tears with the Blood of Christ, to wash away the Guilt of Sin. I cannot but observe, how superficially Mr. *Whitefield* answers this Point. "To avoid all Mistakes, I would express myself in this Manner." These Words look not like one much affected with uttering so much false Divinity.

It is to be observed that with the same Air of Indifference, he corrects his Words, "That we must be new Creatures in Order to qualify us for being savingly in Christ," saying read, "for qualifying us for living eternally with Christ." These are Words of a very different Meaning. Is this the Spirit leading him into the Knowledge of divine Things, according to the Scriptures in the minutest Circumstances; as plainly as the *Jews* were when consulting the *Urim* and *Thummim*? What can be plainer than 2 *Cor.* v. 17. That the new Creature is the Evidence of Ingraftment to Christ, and the Effect of his regenerating Spirit? I do not complain of Mr. *Whitefield's* censuring Arch-Bishop *Tillotson*, who, (whatever were his other excellent Qualities, an Arminian to be sure he was) who intitles one of his Books, on the Nature of Regeneration, and its Necessity in Order to our Justification and Salvation; yet, tho' Mr. *Whitefield*, now that he is found Fault with for the same Doctrine, preached by that Prelate, makes a passing Correction, what shall be thought of him, who was preaching and publishing the same Doctrine to the World, for which he was condemning another?

When Mr. *Whitefield* corrects that Expression, "The Man Christ Jesus is spiritually formed in your Hearts." I would alter it thus, "That Christ is formed within you;" he takes no Notice of an Expression of the same Import, censured by the Querists viz. "That Jesus Christ as the Seed of the Woman who bruised the Serpent's Head, by his Obedience and Sufferings, was spiritually conceived in the Heart of Eve," till he huddle it in with another Thing

How

How contradictory to Truth, and inconsistent with himself is Mr. *Whitefield*, in his Sermon on the indwelling of the Spirit ; when tho' in one Part of it, he says, " That we must actually receive the holy Ghost e'er we can say, that we truly believe in Jesus Christ ;" yet in another Part of it, he says, " For notwithstanding that you are all now sunk into the Nature of the Beast and the Devil, yet, if you truly believe in Jesus Christ, you shall receive the quickning Spirit promised in the Text, and be restored to the glorious Liberty of the Sons of God," Upon this, the Querists do well remark, " Doth not Mr. *Whitefield* in this last Clause seem to make true Faith an antecedent Condition, to be performed by them in Order to receive the quickning Spirit ?" Tho' I am far from making the whole Duty of Man my Confession of Faith, and am of Opinion, that it is a dangerous Book, and falls vastly short of the Title, I cannot but allow the Querists Quotation from it to be better Divinity, than this of Mr. *Whitefield*. Says the whole Duty of Man, " Christ was to enable us, or give us Strength, to do what he requires of us," Says Mr. *Whitefield*, " we must believe e're we receive the quickning Spirit."

Mr. *Whitefield* instead of retracting this Error, goes about to justify it, and thinks to reconcile the jarring Expressions in that Sermon, from the Words of *Paul* to the *Ephesians*, *After ye believed, ye were sealed by the Spirit of Promise*. Might you not as reasonably blamed Jesus Christ, for saying to a dead Man, *Lazarus come forth*. To which it is well replied by the Querists. " That the Aim of the Apostle to the *Ephesians*, is to shew, that they had attained Assurance by the Spirit's Sealing, not at their first Conversion, but after they believed, thereby signifying, that Faith of Adherence may be prior, not only in Order, but in Time to that of Assurance ; the Exercises of the Faith of Adherence being the Means of their receiving a farther Degree of the Spirit, to beget in them Faith of Assurance, which is the Effect of his sealing Work ?

" It were monstrous from this to infer, that they had
 " not received the Spirit in his sanctifying Influence,
 " before they believed. As to Christ's commanding
 " *Lazarus* to come forth, Christ had Power to work
 " the Miracle ; and was exerting his Power in this In-
 " stance at that Time. And for an other who hath not
 " the same Power, to use his Words in the like Case,
 " would be as ridiculous, as Mahomet's commanding
 " the Mountain to come to him, whereas, after all,
 " Mahomet was obliged to go to the Mountain." If
 there were need to add any Thing to these Answers,
 I might remark, that Mr. *Whitefield* cannot justify
 himself by our Lord's Words to *Lazarus*, unless our
 Lord had bid *Lazarus* act Life, before he gave him
 Life, or had bid him rise from the dead by his own
 Power.

However, says Mr. *Whitefield*, instead of quickning
 Spirit, let it be read " sanctifying Spirit." What doth
 that amend the Matter, unless he had been speaking of
 them who were already renewed by the Spirit? But
 his Speech is of them, who, as yet have not the Spirit,
 and are half Brute, half Devil, and who, upon their
 believing, are to receive the Spirit, " and to be restored
 " to the glorious Liberty of the Sons of God." I can
 make no Account of Mr. *Whitefield's* charging the
 the Querists, as arguing unclearly on this Head, unless
 it was to excuse himself at the Hand of his blind Vo-
 taries, for not saying more upon it; since the Querists
 express themselves in a most intelligible Manner.

The Querists justly quarrel what Mr. *Whitefield* hath
 uttered in the former Sermon, that baptising in the
 Name of the Father, &c. might be translated, into the
 Nature of the Father into the Nature of the Son, and into
 the Nature of the holy Ghost. What say the Querists,
 can be meant by baptising Men into the Nature of the
 Father, &c. unless it be regenerating Men? If so,
 can one Man regenerate another? How then could
 this Commission be fulfilled? If the Priest can fulfil
 this Commission in this Sense of it, why may he not
 as well turn the Bread and Wine in the other Sacrament
 into the Body and Blood of Christ?

All that Mr. *Whitefield* answers to this, after we have separated it from his Answer to another Exception huddled in with it, is, "we are made Partakers of the divine Nature. These Words (in the Lord's Prayer) may be left out; tho' if the Word (Name) signifies God's Attributes, why may it not signify his Essence? What are God's Attributes but God himself?"

Any one may see, that there is no Retraction here, nor any Answer to these important Queries put to him: To whose Answer, the Querists do well reply, "By the Texts of Scripture you cite, you seem plainly to grant, that by our being baptised into the Nature of the Trinity, you intend our being made Partakers of the divine Nature, *i. e.* our being regenerated: And therefore we shall ask, whether this Commission impowers and authorises Ministers to regenerate the Persons baptised by them? If so, would it not be a good Deed to baptise the unregenerate? And would it not be a needless Work to baptise one already regenerated? Nor do we see that your leaving out these Words (in the Lords Prayer) doth affect the Matter any Whit for the better. And tho' we stand without wavering to our Concession, that by God's Name in the Lord's Prayer, is signified God's Attributes, Titles, Ordinances, Words and Works, and every Thing by which God maketh himself known; yea, let it be granted further, that God's Attributes, essentially considered, do signify his Essence, for what are God's Attributes in the Sense aforesaid, but God himself? Is this Rope enough to remove the Absurdity? Can a Minister baptise Men into the Essence of God? Will not this lead Men into the old Antinomian Cant, of being godded with God, and christed with Christ? If this be not the native Tendency of this Chain of arguing, will any Body tell us, what Use can be made of the Arguments used here?" But hereby, when we speak of God's Attributes, as one of the Things by which God maketh himself known to us, we do not consider them but as revealed in his Word, and do appear in his Works, in

which Sense they are a Name to us, to know God by.

The Querists had the greater Reason to charge Antinomianism upon him, if it be considered, how he expresses himself in his Letter to the Societies, reprinted this Year at *Edinburgh*, without any Correction of what may warrant this Charge against him; p. 10. 11. "For unless a Man be born again from above, and made a Partaker of the divine Nature, by the Indwelling of God's holy Spirit, he can in no Ways enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." If Mr. *Whitefield* had said no more, I should have applauded his Doctrine, as most true, and necessary Doctrine; but what adds he? "Whoever denies this to be true in the most literal and absolute Sense of the Words, knows nothing as he ought to know." If by the In-dwelling of the Spirit, a Man be Partaker of the divine Nature, in the most real, literal and absolute Sense; What else can it possibly mean, but that the Man who receives the Spirit, becomes God. I wish Mr. *Whitefield* would fairly confess Ignorance and Rashness in such a gross Expression. If there be Design in publishing such Principles, after so many pretended Retractions, what a blasphemous Evangelist must Mr. *Whitefield* be? If he be ready to correct his Errors, sorry I am, that so many Ministers, and others, who are so much devoted to him, should not more strictly inspect what he preaches and prints, but instead of this, are so much taken up in commending and recommending him and his Doctrine.

The *Pensilvanian* Gentlemen ask Mr. *Whitefield*, whether or no, his calling, praying, fasting, hearing, reading, and the Sacraments, not only Means, but also essential Ones too, be not *popish* Dialect? We own the Means of Grace, and Use of them, necessary to us, because commanded, but cannot God save Men without them?

Mr. *Whitefield*'s Amendment is like the Tinkers, who, amending one Hole, put out another; all he says,

is,

is, a
" pa
B
" T
" ar
" fo
" B
" no
" di
" m
" ye
" m
" al
" it
" of
" th
" ft
" ye
" ft
" be
" T
" is,
" G
" d
" to
" u
" te
" of
" w
" D
Mr.
essen
thin
bour
good
to M
tion
will
is,
fin
are

is, after essential ones too, insert, " If Persons are capable of performing them."

But let me here transcribe the Reply of the Querists. " To try the patched Pot newly mended, Sacraments are essential Means, if Persons are capable to perform them. If so, what will become of the whole Body of Mr. *Whitefield's* religious Quakers? Is it not very hard that they are all lost, through the indiscernible Hole, after all the Pains of Scouring and mending the cracked Pot? Is this your Kindness to your Friends? Where is Bigotry now? If Sacraments are essential Means, must it not follow, that all who partake of them are all saved, &c. Will it not follow that all who are capable of partaking of the Ordinances, are capable of performing something that is essential to Salvation? For we must understand that they are spoken of, as Means. What say you now, will it quit Cost, to be at so much Charge to strive to mend an old *Papish* Term? Or will it not be much better to exchange it for the true *Protestant* Term, necessary instead of essential? For the Truth is, Ordinances are necessary, because commanded, &c. To neglect them, when we may enjoy them, or despise them is a crying Sin; but if they are essential to Salvation, how could the Thief on the Cross, or unbaptised Infants be saved, &c. Is it a small Matter, thus to offend against God, and the Generation of his Children, merely for the Sake of symbolizing with Papists in plain Error, &c?"

Do not the Querists justly observe how inconsistent Mr. *Whitefield* is with himself, in making Sacraments essential Means of Salvation, when in his Journal he thinks the Notions of his Quakers in *French Bay*, about walking, and being led by the Spirit, right and good; when yet they denied the Sacraments, according to Mr. *Whitefield*, essential Means of Salvation his Correction, " to them that are capable of performing them," will not secure the Salvation of his spiritual Quakers, since they who deny an essential Mean of Salvation, are not in a Capacity of performing it, and since they

despise an essential Mean of Salvation, what Spirit walk they by? By what Spirit are they guided? surely not, by the Spirit of God. In whatever high Esteem their Spirit may be with Mr. *Whitefield*, I am sorry he hath such a Mixture of their Spirit.

I might further observe on his Answers to the *Pen-silvanian* Queries, and how much he hath neglected to answer many of them, at the Time he hath but superficially answered the most of them; but this Enquiry swelling on my Hand, I would lay before you other unsound Articles, gathered from his printed Performances; and some of them but of a late Date, of which, I have not heard any Retractation, and in some of which Errors, he doth with great Assurance persist.

How ill must Mr. *Whitefield* be instructed in the christian System, when his Errors do affect so great a Part of it? What an inconsiderate, or ill designing Preacher must he be, when, tho' in one Part of his Works, he would seem Orthodox in some Points; in other Parts of them these are again destroyed.

For all the Orthodoxy he would sometimes pretend about the Decrees, and God's distinguishing everlasting Love; how doth he mistake the Matter? when p. 13. of his Sermon on what think ye of Christ? He says, "the Reason or first Cause why the Son of God took "on him our Nature was the Fall of our first Parents." Far is it from me to say with the old Schoolmen, or with the *Socinians*, that Jesus Christ would have taken on him the Nature of Man, if Man had not sinned; yet the first Cause was God's eternal Purpose of Love. *John* iii. 18. 1. *Pet* i. 19, 20 *Eph*. i. 4. *Rom*. viii. 30. *Rom*. v. 8. and many other Places. Let us hear our excellent *Westminster* Confession, Chap. 3. Sect. 5. 6. "Those of Mankind who are predestinated unto "Life, before the Foundation of the World was laid "God, according to his eternal immutable Purpose, "and the secret Council and good Pleasure of his "Will, hath chosen in Christ to everlasting Glory, "out of his mere free Grace and Love, without any
" Foresight

“ Foresight of Faith or good Works, or Perseverance
 “ in either of them, or any other Thing in the Crea-
 “ tures, as Conditions or Causes moving him there-
 “ unto----as God hath appointed the Elect unto Glory,
 “ so hath he by the eternal and most free Purpose of
 “ his Will, foreordained all the Means thereunto.”

There cannot be any Thing plainer in Opposition to
 Mr. *Whitefield*'s Doctrine. To this agrees the Doctrine
 of the Church of *England* in their seventeenth Ar-
 ticle. “ Predestination to Life, is the everlasting Pur-
 “ pose of God, whereby (before the Foundations of
 “ the World were laid) he hath constantly decreed by
 “ his Council Secret to us, to deliver from Curse and
 “ Damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ
 “ out of Mankind, and to bring them by Christ to e-
 “ verlasting Salvation, as Vessels, made to Honour.”

As Mr. *Whitefield* hath thus preached erroneously
 concerning the first Cause of Christ's assuming the hu-
 man Nature, so hath he done the same, concerning the
 Revelation of the eternal Design and Purpose of Grace,
 when p. 1. of his Sermon on the Eternity of Hell Tor-
 “ ments, he says, “ The Excellency of the Gospel Dis-
 “ pensation is evidenced by nothing more, than these
 “ Sanctions of Rewards and Punishments it offers to the
 “ Choice of its Professors.” How greedily would a
Socinian swallow down this Doctrine, or any others
 who deny the Satisfaction of Christ? Doth not the
 Excellency of the Gospel Dispensation ly in the glad
 Tidings of great Joy, that to us is born a Saviour,
 Jesus the Lord; that he hath shed his Blood, and
 made Peace by his Death? I allow all Regard to
 the Sanctions of Rewards and Punishments, revealed in
 the Word; but where should be the Reward, if there
 had not been Attonement? What Choice should Go-
 spel Professors make, if there were not a regenerating
 Work of the Spirit, determining them? And there-
 fore by these, more than any Thing else, the Excel-
 lency of the Gospel Dispensation is evidenced.

Doth Mr. *Whitefield* broach his Mistakes upon the
 Decree, and the Revelation of the Purpose of Grace?

He

He doth so also, and that in a most dangerous Way, upon the Means of our partaking of Grace. Mr. *Whitefield* lays sometimes the most dangerous Errors beside some very precious Truth. We find him, P. 11. of his Sermon on Self-denial, speaking about our being spiritually dead, and that the Power of raising the spiritually dead, belongeth only to God; but he dashes all down again, Pag. 15. "When Jesus is about to take Possession of a converted Sinner's Heart, Self-denial like *John* the Baptist must prepare the Way before him." Here a strange Patch! a Sinner converted, and Christ not as yet possessing his Heart; a Sinner converted, but yet Christ not possessing his Heart, till Self-denial like *John* the Baptist prepare the Way before him! Here the Plough before the Oxen, here the Effect before the Cause; till Christ possess our Hearts by his Spirit, there will be no Self-denial, unless it be meant of a patcht Gown and dirty Shoes, and the like.

What Mr. *Whitefield* had before said of our being spiritually dead, and that nothing but the Power of God can raise the spiritually dead; he weakens again, P. 16. "Since we are fall'n, sickly, disordered Creatures, this Self-suffering, Self-Renunciation, are the indispensable Means of recovering our primitive Glory." In one Part he would have us dead, in another Part, he would have us sickly and disordered. In one Part, he would only have us raised by the Power of God, in another Part, he makes Self-suffering, and Self-renunciation, the indispensable Means of our Recovery, when it is utterly impossible that they who are dead in Trespasses and Sins can thus deny themselves.

One would be ready to judge Mr. *Whitefield* most Orthodox P. 19, of that Sermon, when he says, "Our Souls by Nature are in a spiritual Dungeon, sleeping and fast bound between the World, the Flesh and the Devil, not with two, but ten thousand Chains of Lusts and Corruptions." All good, but how are we delivered? He says, "Now Jesus Christ like St.

" *Peter's*

" *Peter's* good Angel by his Gospel, comes and opens
 " the Prison Door, prescribes Self-Denial, Mortifica-
 " tion, Renuntiation of our selves, and the World, as
 " so many spiritual Keys which will unlock our
 " Sheckles, make them fall off from our Hearts, and
 " to restore us to the glorious Liberty of the Sons of
 " God." I think no Wonder that this be Mr. *White-*
field's Doctrine, since he hath learned it from Dr. *Scou-*
gal's Life of God in the Soul of Man, and hath formed
 his conversional Experiences so much on that Book,
 which yet is recommended by Dr. *Wishart* without any
 Animadversion made by the Judicatures of the Church.
 Alas! how little is the Truth looked to? my Chains
 will never fall off, if Christ open not the Prison Door;
 if his insuperable Power, be not the Key to open the
 Prison Door. Mr. *Whitefield's* Doctrine, and that of
 our excellent *Westminster* Confession, are Antipodes.
 Chap. 9. Sect. 3. " Man by his Fall into a State of
 " Sin, hath wholly lost Ability of Will to any spiritu-
 " al good accompanying Salvation; so as a natural
 " Man being altogether averse from that good, and
 " dead in Sin, is not able by his own Strength to con-
 " vert himself, or prepare himself thereunto. Sect. 4.
 " When God converts a Sinner, and translates him in-
 " to a State of Grace, he freeth him from his natural
 " Bondage under Sin; and by his Grace alone, enables
 " him freely to will, and to do that which is spiritual-
 " ly good." Yea his Doctrine is not agreeable to the
 10th Article of the Church of *England*, which yet he
 pretends to have proven by the Scriptures. *viz.* " The
 " Condition of Man after the Fall of *Adam* is such,
 " that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own
 " natural Strength and good Works, to Faith and
 " calling upon God. Wherefore we have no Power
 " to do good Works pleasant and acceptable to God,
 " without the Grace of God by Christ preventing us,
 " that we may have a good Will, and working with
 " us, when we have that good Will." It might
 take a Volume to shew the Danger there is in this
 Doctrine of Mr. *Whitefield's*, and how much real Re-
 ligion

ligion is indangered thereby, tho' while preaching such Doctrine, he is making high Pretensions to the Spirit, and of being an Instrument of converting Souls. I would wish to be tender of judging about People's Conversion to God, but I may here well use the Words of the Prophet *Zech. iv. 6.* *Not by Might, nor by Power, but my Spirit, saith the Lord.*

If I knew not another Way of a Soul's Conversion to God, than according to Mr. *Whitefield's* Doctrine, I could not talk with any Consistency so assuredly of an Interest in Christ, as he doth in his Letter to Mr. *John Wesley, December, 1740.* p. 21. "For these five or six Years, I have received the Witness of God's Spirit, since that, I have not doubted a Quarter of an Hour of having an Interest in Christ." For by the same Means, I am recovered out of the Prison of Sin, and restored to the glorious Liberty of the Sons of God; by these Means, am I preserved in that State; now, if my own Deeds, namely my Self-suffering, and Self-renunciation, be the Key to the one, they are the Preservative to the other, and if so, how can a Man on such a slippery Bottom have Assurance, especially such a long continued Run of it?

But this brings me to another of Mr. *Whitefield's* Errors, which respects Faith, and affects the Evidence of our Interest in Christ, p. 18. of that Sermon, "What think ye of Christ? In the very moment we apprehend Christ's Righteousness by a lively Faith, we shall be assured that the Blood of Christ hath cleansed us from all Sin." Now he speaks of apprehending the Righteousness of Christ by a true and lively Faith, different Doctrine from the former, still serving to discover his medley and mixture of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy; but even here, he cannot speak without another Error, leaping from one Extreme to another, and leaving his Readers at an Uncertainty, whether the one or the other, is his stated or fixed Principle. The Doctrine of the one Sermon is calculated to an Arminian, and the Doctrine of the other to an Antinomian Taste. I might enlarge on this, as on every other

other Article; but however much an esteemed Evangelist Mr. *Whitefield* is, among them who call themselves Presbyterians, this Doctrine is in the strongest Terms different from the Doctrine of our excellent *Westminster* Confession. Chap. 18. Sect. 3. "This infallible Assurance doth not so belong to the Essence of Faith, but that a true Believer may wait long, and conflict with many Difficulties, before he be Partaker of it."

The Righteousness of Jesus Christ apprehended by Faith is the alone Foundation of my Hope; but what shall I think of Christ's Righteousness, in that consummating Act of his passive Obedience upon the Cross, if I adopt that dangerous Assertion of his, p. 6. of his Sermon in *October* last, on *Cant. v. 16.* "That the Divinity is drawn from Christ, and he is put to cry, my God, &c. If I interpreted that Cry, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? as signifying the Divinity's being drawn from Christ, then the Sufferings of Christ upon the Cross, were the Sufferings of a mere Man, and so not meritorious. This I think may be well added to his other Errors.

Mr. *Whitefield* in his Answer to the *Pennsylvanian* Querists, pretends to correct these Words in his Marks of the new Birth, "We shall endure to the End, if we continue so." I think it not right for him to pretend a favourable Interpretation of these Words, which are so strong in Prejudice of the precious and comfortable Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints; but his Farewell Sermon at *Edinburgh*, in *October* last on *Phil. i. 27, 28.* if it have any Sense in it, or can convey any distinct Idea to his Hearers or Readers, looks as unfavourably upon this precious Doctrine, p. 3. "It is much on my Soul, least any of you should walk disorderly, after you have had converting Grace, and should shew the World, you had only a common Work." No Doubt they who have had converting Grace, may walk disorderly, and the World may conclude, that they never had converting Grace, but only that it was a common Work; but a walking disorderly after converting Grace, is no Evidence that it was a common

Work, or that they who had once converting Grace are now fall'n from it to the Condition of them that had only a common Work. But I stay not on this Expression, since it seems equally defective of Sense or Orthodoxy.

Mr. *Whitefield* is no less injurious to the Merit and Intercession of Christ, on the Head of the Acceptance and Influence of the Prayers of a righteous Man, than he is to the Power of Grace in the Conversion of Sinners, when he saith in his Sermon for praying for others : “ I cannot but recommend to you one general mean to make your Prayers effectual, that is, to lead such Lives as to make your Prayers accepted in the Beloved. The effectual fervent Prayer of the righteous Man availeth much. It is this, it is this my Brethren you must make your Intercessions pierce the Clouds, for the Prayers of the wicked are an Abomination to the Lord.” Here are some Scripture Expressions mixed with his own Leaven : Who will dispute it, that is of a sound mind, that they must ask amiss who ask not in Faith ? That it is only they who pray in the Name of Christ, in a Dependence on his Merit, that can be accepted ? But if we say that our holy Lives make our Prayers accepted in the Beloved, what do we but mix our holy Lives, and the Merit of Christ together, as the Ground of our Acceptance ? Why are the Sacrifices of the wicked an Abomination, but that they are not in Faith ? Why are the Prayers of the righteous Man so available, but that he pleads not his own, but Christ's Righteousness, as the Reason of his Acceptance ? But what says Mr. *Whitefield* ? It is this, it is this (your holy Lives,) that must make your Intercession pierce the Clouds : The Lord Jesus Christ is the Angel of the Covenant, who offers up the Prayers of the Saints with the Incense of his Merit, Rev. viii. It is the Smoak of that Incense which brings up their Prayers before the Throne, and not the Holiness of their Lives.

How far Mr. *Whitefield* goes to meet the Papists, in their Doctrine of the Efficacy of the Ordinance, its depending on the Administrator, will be best determined

by

by his own Words, but whether his Friends will admit of his sweying to the popish Error in this, or not, they will not be able to purge him from the Error of the Donatists on this Head, in his Sermon at *Glasgow*, *Sept.* 12. 1741. on *Luke* iv. 18. 19. p. 6. "It is absolutely necessary before a Minister undertake to preach the Gospel, that he have an experimental Acquaintance with Jesus Christ, p. 8. It is indeed impossible in the very Nature of Things, that a Man should preach Christ who doth not know him. p. 10. It is the Opinion of the reformed Churches, that the holy Ghost is absolutely necessary before a Man take on him the Office of a Minister, p. 12. I believe God doth not convert others by unconverted Men."

That Ministers should be holy Men, and Men full of the holy Ghost, and that the Credit and Success of the Gospel is much hindred by the Unholiness of Ministers; this we have held, before we heard of Mr. *Whitefield's* Name; and we do lament it, that there is much Cause to fear, that many rush into the Ministry, before they have experimental Acquaintance with Jesus Christ: But since the Efficacy of the Ordinances depends not on the Administrator, but the Power of God; Mr. *Whitfield* sways to the Papists, in this his Doctrine; or because of the alledged Success of his Ministry, he would have this looked upon as a Token of his being a converted Man, and full of the Holy Ghost; only it is unlucky for him, that he forgets, that he hath told us in the Account of God's Dealings with his Soul, p. 20. that he himself was made an Instrument of converting one, and this before the Spirit had taken Possession of his Soul, as p. 33. How ignorantly doth he speak, when he says, "That it is impossible in the very Nature of Things, that a Man should preach Christ, who doth not know him." When there can be nothing more certain than this, that an unregenerate Man may have great Gifts, and much Orthodoxy in his Judgment; and it is past Debate, that *Judas* preached the same Doctrine with the other Disciples of Christ. But besides this, Mr. *Whitefield* makes the most affront-

ed Discovery of his Ignorance that can be, when he says, " That this is the Opinion of the reformed Churches, that the Holy Ghost is absolutely necessary, before a Man take on him the Office of a Minister." This is so far from being true, that it is not the Opinion of the Church of *England*, whose Articles he pretends to have proven by the Scriptures. Let us read their 26th Article. " Altho,' in the visible Church, the Evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometime " the Evil have chief Authority in the Ministration of " Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not " the same in their own Name, but Christ's, and do " minister by his Commission and Authority, we may " use their Ministry, both in the hearing the Word " of God, and in receiving the Sacraments. Neither " is the Effect of Christ's Ordinance taken away by " their Wickedness, nor the Grace of God's Gift diminished from such, as by Faith, and rightly do " receive the Sacraments ministred unto them, which " be effectual because of Christ's Institution and Promise, altho' they be ministred by evil Men." What a Reproach do the Ministers and Professors in *Scotland* bring themselves under, who set up this ignorant Man as some uncommon Person, who strolling about from Place to Place, preaches down the Article, he says, he had proven by the Scriptures, and who pours out such a Flood of *Popish* Nonsense.

But this is not all wherein he favours them; altho' he hath not as yet got their Doctrine of auricular Confession in Form to obtain, that People may disclose the Secrets of their Hearts to the Priest, he is preparing the Way for this Doctrine, when p. 16 of his Letter to the Societies, he would have them, " Forming themselves into little Companies of four or five each, to " meet once a Week, to tell each other what is in " your Hearts." All the Difference in the Confession here, from the *Popish* is, that this is made to four, or five; the *Popish* is made to the Priest, who pretends he is under a Bond of Secrecy, but here no such Bond; so that if Mr. *Whitefield's* Directions shall obtain, he may find

find out all the Secrets that are upon the Hearts of his
 Volaries, by cultivating Intimacy with one or other
 of the Number constituting such Societies.

But tho' Mr. *Whitefield* hath in his Doctrine or Jour-
 nals, Letters or weekly Histories, been so complaisant
 to *Papists*, *Quakers*, and different Denominations of
Protestants, shall it be alledged that he gives any Strokes
 in Favour of *Deists*? Some may say, it cannot be that
 such a zealous Evangelist as he will do that. Well then,
 if he do not that, I wish any Person would explain to
 me the Words, p. 23, 24. of his adopted and applau-
 ded Extract, annexed to his Letter to the Societies.
 "There is therefore a catholick Spirit, a Communion
 of Saints in the Love of God and all Goodness,
 which no one can learn from that which is called
 Orthodoxy in particular Churches, but is only to be
 had by a total dying to all worldly Views, by a pure
 Love of God, and such an Unction from above, as
 delivers the Mind from all Selfishness, and makes it
 love Truth and Goodness, with an Equality of Af-
 fection in every Man, whether he be Christian, Jew,
 or Gentile." This catholick Spirit of Mr. *White-*
field's is to promote Communion of Saints, in the Love
 of God and all Goodness, in every Man whether he
 be Christian, Jew, or Gentile. Mr. *Whitefield's* catho-
 lick Charity then, promotes the Communion of Saints.
 But what Saints? Christian Saints, Jewish Saints,
 Heathen Saints. This his catholick Charity is in
 downright Contradiction to the 18th Article of the
 Church of *England*, which he hath proved by the
 Scriptures. "They are to be held as accursed, who
 presume to say, that every Man shall be saved by the
 Law or Sect which he professeth, so as he be diligent
 to frame his Life according to that Law, and the
 Light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set out
 unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby
 Men must be saved."

After Mr. *Whitefield's* Account of his catholick Cha-
 rity, and catholick Communion with Christian Saints,
 Jewish Saints and Heathen Saints, one needs not wonder to
 find

find him endeavouring to establish a Communion between *Papists* and *Protestants*. Read his Words in his applauded Extract, p. 23. "I will venture to say, that if each Church should produce but one Man a Piece, that had the Piety of an Apostle, and the impartial Love of the first Christians, in the first Church at Jerusalem, that a *Protestant* and a *Papist* of this Stamp, would not want half a Sheet of Paper to hold their Articles of Union, nor be half an Hour before they were of one Religion."

Altho' the Reverend Mr. *Webster* of *Edinburgh*, in a Postscript to a late printed Letter of his, hath written one of the most bitter Invectives, that ever I saw, against the Rev. Mr. *Gib's* Performance relative to Mr. *Whitefield*, I have yet one Copy of that Book preserved from the Flames, to which I shew that Respect as to transcribe a little of what he says, on this presently mentioned Doctrine, adopted by Mr. *Whitefield*. "How then would this Union and Oneness between the *Papist* and the *Protestant* be effectuate? The *Papist* behoved not to urge the *Protestant* to become *Papist*, this would contradict universal Love: Neither must the *Protestant* urge the *Papist* to become *Protestant*, this still drubbs the Darling of universal Love. We have not yet hit the Mystery, he that would like as God likes, and condemn as God condemns, must neither have the Eyes of the *Papist*, nor of the *Protestant*, as p. 25th of Mr. *Whitefield's* Extract. If this whole hellish Doctrine have any Sense, the Union and Oneness of Religion must come about this Way; the *Papist* and *Protestant* would mutually drop every Thing that is opposite in *Popery* and *Protestancy*, retaining nothing but their apostolick Piety, and primitive Impartiality of Love (both which may seem still remain intire) and both would ly indifferenced, upon this (Utopian) Centre of Piety and Love." There needs no Addition to this, and should have been sorry, if the Sentence of the Rev. Mr. *Webster* had been executed upon it.

After what hath been taken Notice of, it needs be a Surprize to find this zealous-like Reformer preaching of an unbounded Toleration, and praying as in his adopted Extract, p. 27. "That every Church may have its Saints, that God's Kingdom may come, his Will be done in every Division of Christians and Men." Do not *Socinians* profess Christianity, tho' they deny the Deity of Jesus Christ. What means his Prayer, if not that there may be *Socinian* Saints?

If the Author meant, that they might be recover'd from their Errors, the Prayer had been commendable: but the Prayer is, that every Church, every profess'd Church, may have their Saints; and to limit his Meaning, he wishes, that "God's Kingdom may come, and his Will be done in every Division of Christians and Men." If God's Kingdom come, and his Will be done in every Division of Christians and Men, then we must have Christian Saints, *Jewish* Saints, *Heathen* Saints, *Mahometan* Saints, for all these are within the Compass of every Division of Men. I cannot put another Meaning upon the Words; for, if they should signify a Prayer for Recovery from the dangerous Division they are of, then it had not been, that God's Will might be done in every Division of Christians and Men; for this admits, that the Will of God may be done among them; to whatever Part of the Division of Men or Christians they do belong, and is obviously the Meaning of the Extract. But, to put the Matter beyond all Doubt, as to his unbounded and extravagant Toleration, in his last *American* Journal, giving an Account of the five thousand Acres of good Ground which he hath bought on *Delaware* River, he says, "That here he resolves that all Opinions shall be free." Here Mr. *Whitefield* goes beyond all the Patrons of Toleration that I remember of, who are satisfied, if in the Countries, where they live, they have Liberty for their several Opinions, tho' they be not invited to live in a Country of another Opinion. Tolerations have been granted under Pretence of quieting the Minds of the People of a Land differing in their Opinions;

Opinions; but to buy Ground, and invite Men of all Opinions to dwell upon it, is another Thing: I wish Mr. *Whitefield* have not the Improvement of his Ground, or some other secret Design more in his Eye, than the promoting the Truth of the Gospel; a strange Reformer, to invite Blasphemers of the Son of God to reside on his Ground; this must be, if all Opinions are there to be free. I hope he doth not invite Hereticks there to admonish them, and then to excommunicate them, if not reclaimed; if he should do this, he would spoil his Invitation. How far his Proclamation agrees with the Doctrine of Gods Word, I shall without any Comment (for truly it needs none) refer you to 2 *John* x. 11. *If there come any unto you, and bring not this Doctrine, receive him not into your House, neither bid him God speed----for he that biddeth him Good speed, is Partaker of his evil Deeds.*

I hope further, it will not be denied, that Mr. *Whitefield* is a Promoter of the *English* Forms, and Ceremonies; he says in one of his Journals of 1739. Page 2. "I have no Objection against, but highly approve of the excellent Liturgy of our Church, would Ministers lend me their Churches to use it in." In his Sermon on what think ye of Christ? Page 23. he says, "I am fully persuaded, that it is not so much on the Account of the Rites and Ceremonies, as of our not preaching the Truth as it is in Jesus, that so many dissent from the Church of *England*." Is it not our Principle, whatever be Mr. *Whitefield*'s, as in our excellent *Westminster* Confession, Chap. 21. Sect. 1. "That the acceptable Way of Worshipping the true God, is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed Will; that he may not be worshipped according to the Imagination and Devices of Men." We cannot distinguish this from the Truth as it is in Jesus, as Mr. *Whitefield* doth; we think this a Part of the Truth of Jesus.

I hope Retractions will not be alledged on this Head, since in his Answers to the *Pensilvanian* Queries, he hath look'd over this, and given no Answer

But a
mon
and
some
paper
ers v
off h
Para
" as
" q
" an
" w
" sh
" th
" gi
" re
" a
on t
new
and
true
beca
lera
us,
Wo
need
diffe
sing
fect
that
I fo
Poi
" fice
Wa
just
for
the
W
lic
Bu

But as when in *England* he practises their Rites, Ceremonies, and Forms of Worship; so in *Scotland* now and then, when he thought it convenient, he hath sometimes from one Text, sometimes from another, paped out some Expressions to soften his *Scotish* Hearers with Respect to Forms, and yet they have not left off hearing him. Read Page 11. of his Sermon on the Parable of the Virgins. "The Wise had their Lamps" as well as the Foolish--for Christianity doth not require to cast off outward Forms--we may use Forms and not be formal. For Instance, it is possible to worship God in a set Form of Prayer, and yet worship him in Spirit and in Truth, and therefore, Brethren, let us not judge one another---the wise Virgins had their Lamps, herein did not ly the Difference between them, that the one worshipped with "a Form, the other not." Mr. *Whitefield's* Comment on this Parable, that the Virgins used set Forms, is new; for by Lamps is meant a Profession of Religion, and not set Forms of Prayer. I know no Man of true Understanding that will judge the State of another, because of his praying by stated Forms. Since the Toleration Act, they have got too much Footing among us, and it is well seen how much the Spirituality of Worship hath been on the Decline since; we had no need of Mr. *Whitefield* to smoooth Men in to an Indifferency about them; the next Step will be a practising of them, for now his Followers that were disaffected to that Way of Worship are become chiller on that Head, and others of them speak favourably. But I forget, my Purpose is not to stay to reason every Point, but to verify my Instances.

Tell me, Sir, if it can be thought a seasonable Office to call in Mr. *Whitefield* to reclaim from narrow Ways of thinking, when a slack Way of thinking is so justly complained of; and when so few are standing up for the covenanted Reformation-work in *Scotland*, and they are persecuted and deposed who do it? Tho' Mr. *Whitefield* holds still with the Church of *England* that licensed him to preach, is he not yet going about

L

preaching

preaching an Indifferency about the Government of Christ's House? As if to contend for it, were no more than a contending about Meats and Drinks, and as he preached in *Aberdeen* on *Rom. xiv 17.* that we are not to contend about what we may go to Heaven without; and in his Conference with *Dr. Cutler* in *New England*, "That our Lord never required his Disciples to be one in that; yea, that it never was his Intent." This was not the Mind of the Compilers of the *Westminster* Confession, Chap. 30th, Sect. 1. "The Lord Jesus as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a Government in the Hand of Church Officers, distinct from the Civil Magistrate." Could such be of Opinion, that the Government of the Church was an arbitrary indifferent Thing?

But I must make up, being now wearied in earnest, only before I leave the Head of Doctrine, I must notice two Excuses that *Mr. Whitefield* usually offers, when attacked about his Doctrine; namely, 1. "That he hath retracted, or is ready to retract his Errors, when shewn him. 2. That many Things wrong in his Expressions are the Effects of his corrupt Education."

To these I would answer, that he hath not shewn such a pliable retracting Humour, in his Answers to the *Pensilvanian* Queries as he pretends. Again, if he be now better instructed, he ought to follow *Augustine's* Example, to write a Book of Retractions, and this of his own Accord; for his quitting what he cannot hold, when found Fault with, is not a very satisfying Way. But in the next Place, that he might undeceive our Presbyterians, who were fond to think he would be no more of the Church of *England*, nor for some loose Things besides, no sooner is he come to *Scotland* than he reprints his Letter to the Societies, with the scandalous Extract. As for his Excuse for the Prejudices of his Education, he should either (he is not so far advanced in Years) have been better instructed before he had entred into the Ministry, or he should not have pretended

pretended to such an uncommon Measure of the Spirit of God, when he was going about preaching damnable Doctrine. But what tho' he hath superficially retracted some Things, or doth pretend a Readiness to retract other Errors, since the Time hath been, that any One of ^{the} above mentioned Errors would have deposed any Minister of the Church of *Scotland*. Have these Ministers, Elders and Professors, who invited such an ignorant, unsound Preacher to *Scotland*, shown a due Concern for our Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government? If Mr. *Whitefield's* Orthodoxy be to be trusted, let him retract his Errors before any Presbyterian Judicature, and be accountable to them for his Doctrine and Conduct; but to be going about from Country to Country, and Place to Place, preaching at Random, and only quitting what he cannot hold, when found Fault with, is of such dangerous Consequence, as might call both Pastors and People to their Feet, if both wise and foolish Virgins were not slumbering and sleeping; and while it is thus with them, this transformed Enemy is sowing Tares.

But to proceed; if Immorality and Irregularity in his Life and Conduct, doth appear from his own printed Performances, they have the less to answer, who join in Communion with him in the Ordinances of the Gospel. I am very unwilling to attack any Man in such a tender and delicate Point, if it were not to offer a Check to his high Pretensions, and to shew their Rashness who enquire not into the Matter.

When I read some of Mr. *Whitefield's* Prints, I am not able to purge him from some of those Characters in 2 *Tim.* iii. 2, 3. *Boasters, proud, heady, high minded.*" With how much of vain Glory doth Mr. *Whitefield* write in his Journals, Letters and weekly Histories, tho' there were not another Proof than his Letter in *June* last to Mr. *Abbot*? "I was filled with the Holy Ghost, ----- the Holy Ghost overshadowed us. ----- I prayed with Power." But to make a Collection of such of his Words, would need a Book by it self. Number 21. of his weekly History, in his

Letter to *Howel Harris*. "I have a constant Levee of
 " wounded Souls, - - - I walk continually in the Com-
 " forts of the holy Ghost." A better Fellow must Mr.
Whitefield be, than the Apostle *Paul*.

Taking his Leave of his Friends at *Bexley*, and
Gravesend, Anno, 1739. he says, " Their Hearts were
 " ready to break with Sorrow. But God I hope, will
 " supply my Absence, by raising up more Ministers to
 " to go out and in before them." Wo's me ! are Gos-
 " pel Ministers so very scarce in *England*? But it seems
 Mr. *Whitefield* looks on the Case as no better in *Scot-*
land, in his Farewel Sermon at *Edinburgh*, October
 1741. " And if it be God's Will that your Rejoicing
 " may be for me whether I will be here or not ; draw
 " me by your Prayers, and if you will wrestle with
 " God by Prayer, then the Lord Jesus Christ may re-
 " store me to you." He must needs think himself, a
 very necessary Man, where it cannot be denied there are
 many Gospel Ministers, and where there was no Need
 of the like of him ; for once more, see the Image of the
 boasting vain glorious Thing, p. 18. of the same
 Sermon. " You pray, and I will fight." But a
 Collection on this Head would be almost endless.

Mr. *Whitefield* discovers much Bitterness and Uncha-
 ritableness of Spirit, under a Disguise of Love and
 Humility. Read but for a Specimen his Answer to the
Pennsylvanian Querists, " Some of the latter Part of your
 " Queries, for your own and not for my Sake, I shall
 " not mention. I hope I can say with more Sincerity
 " than *Hazael*, Is your Servant a Dog that he should
 " do what you suggest? But I pray God forgive you: He
 " knows my Heart. I wish the Presbytery had advised
 " you against dipping your Pen in so much Gall ;
 " surely your Informations are contrary to Charity." I
 can see nothing in their Queries but what is discreet ;
 but their Return is the best Commentary on Mr. *White-*
field's Words. " As to your appropriating to your self
 " the Words of *Hazael*, and your professing Sincerity
 " in your doing so, God alone is Judge of both ; we
 " do not desire to meddle with the one or the other,

" till you tell us the Particulars you level at ; only we
 " would ask you, whether this be the Proof of the Re-
 " ality of your high Pretensions to good Humour, &c.
 " As for your Prayers to God for Forgiveness to us,
 " we cannot but look upon it as a weak, if not a wick-
 " ed Way of arguing. For if we have wronged your
 " Words, why do ye not shew us, wherein, and fairly
 " convince us of our Error ; if you cannot, at least,
 " do not that ; is it not wrong to make Use of God's
 " Name, and the Ordinance of Prayer, in Order to
 " cast an Odium upon your Fellow-Christians, as if we
 " were Transgressors in Words, when you cannot, at
 " least do not, fix on the offensive Words ?" It is usual
 with Mr. *Whitefield* to pretend to pray for People when
 he cannot answer them, than which there cannot be a
 greater Expression of a sly and bitter Spirit.

I am unwilling to bring a Charge of tricking and
 Dishonesty against him; I wish he may stand clear of all
 these, when his Books are balanced. What little De-
 signs must he needs have in his Eye by his weekly Hi-
 story, giving an Account of the late Success of the Go-
 spel, when many Things are ingrossed there, that are
 but Collections from his other Letters and Journals, yea
 some Things in some of the Numbers, have no Relation
 to the Title. For a Specimen, Numbers 38. and 39.
 contain an excellent Letter of Mr. *Rutherford's* to his
 Parishoners an hundred Years ago. I cannot find here
 any History or Prophecy of the present Success of the
 Gospel. I am not short of Instances of this Kind. If
 Ministers were to print all the good Letters they may
 receive, they might write an History liker a true Ac-
 count of Gospel Success, than Mr. *Whitefield's* amu-
 sing Story. But they are so sensible of the Unsuccess-
 fulness of the Gospel, that they will not boast on such
 slight Grounds. I wish they who are good Accomptants
 would impartially read over the first printed Account
 of the money collected for his Orphan House, particu-
 larly from *December 1738. to August 1739.* and com-
 pare therewith the Collections for that End mentioned
 in his Journals for these months, and then tell me if

Matters, (however artfully) be truly ballanced. How strange is it for him to tell the World that he was 800 *L. Ster.* in Debt for that House, when yet, he a poor Lad, but six or seven Years ago, living on Charity, had money enough to buy five thousand Acres of good Land, on *Delaware River*. By what is lately published his Debt is reduced to 600 *L. Sterl.* Have all his vast Collections in *Scotland* last Year, made no greater Reduction on the Debt? He begins to advertise for more Money and Goods, tho' he owns his Family is removed from *Georgia*, because they will need some other Place. What is there to hinder their Settlement on his Acres on *Delaware River*? It is true, *English Men* will not serve so drudgingly on his Ground as *Negroes*, for whom he pretends great christian Designs. Let People give away their Money as they please, but whatever become of the Orphan-House, it is evident Mr. *Whitefield* hath in five Years Time, collected himself rich. We commonly say, he is a sorry Cook who may not lick his own Fingers, but the Apostle *Paul* when he contributed for the poor Saints, was not so expensive a Servant as Mr. *Whitefield*; nor did he and others take that Trust upon them, but as they were *chosen of the Churches*, 2 *Cor.* viii. 19. Mr. *Whitefield* hath not gone so orderly to Work.

What Faithfulness or Care hath Mr. *Whitefield* shown about the Souls, that were committed to his Trust at the *Savannah*? He tells us in his last *American Journal*, "That God called him not to settle but to evangelise, therefore he gives up with his Charge." Pretensions to God's Call for warranting such disorderly Practices hath something in it so very bad, that I have not a significative enough Name for it. No Doubt, if he dealt with any Integrity, he thought that God once called him to settle, but now he finds that God called him not to settle. It is likewise evident from his Journals, that tho' he took a Charge in *Georgia*, he minded not any Thing less than it; he runs through the Country, pretending Zeal for winning Souls to Christ, but neglects and deserts the Souls that were committed to his Trust.

I may

I may add to the former as a just Exception against his Character and Conduct, that at the Time he pretends great Zeal for winning Souls to Christ, he employs his Time and Labour, where there is least need for him. Surely if he pursued honestly this End, he had found it more needful to stay in *America*, than come to *England*; and that many Places in *England*, who have so little of the Gospel preached to them, stood in more need of him than *Scotland*, and that more remote and destitute Corners in *Scotland*, had more need of him, than *Edinburgh*, *Glasgow*, *Dundee*, &c. where Mr. *Whitefield* labours so abundantly, and more abundantly than in *America*, where in a Country of 30,000 white People, he can travel above two hundred Miles, without preaching above once, and where there are not above three or four Ministers. The Apostle preached, and choose to preach Christ not where he was named, lest he should build on another Man's Foundation. I think Mr. *Whitefield* will not pretend, that this is his Way, at least when he is in *Scotland*.

I wish Mr. *Whitefield* could purge himself of Dissimulation and Disingenuity; when he is in *Scotland*, he will say, that the Church of *Scotland* is the purest and best reformed national Church; when he is in *England*, he wishes the Church of *England* were the Joy of the whole Earth; and p. 2. of his Sermon on Justification, he looks on them "as unhappy who dissent from the present ecclesiastical Establishment." If he think, as he says in *Scotland*, when he goes to *England* he sins against his Light, when he joins not those Protestants who are more purely reformed, but chooses to continue in, and join with Corruption; if they are Words of Course, contrived to flatter according to the Side of the *Tweed* he preaches on, how sadly doth it rub on his Character. In his Sermon preached at *Glasgow*, *Sept.* 1741. upon *Jer.* vi. 14. p. 24. he says, "Many cry out against the Ceremonies of the Church, as they may justly do." And yet I hope he will not deny the using of them, when he returned to *England*, and communicating and giving the Sacrament there, after their Manner; what shall we call

this? a Man to preach down in *Scotland*, what he practises in *England*; a Man to commend one Thing in *England*, and the contrary in *Scotland*.

I am sorry that a Man of such high Pretensions as Mr. *Whitefield*, should not only trick and dissemble, but publish to the World in his weekly History, plain Falsehoods: I would give you an undoubted Specimen from the Number 30th, of his weekly History, *Brechin, October 17th, 1741.* to Mr. *Cennick* at *London*, from Mr. *Whitefield* himself. “ Dr. Br. God appeared for me in an extraordinary Manner at *Aberdeen*.” What was the Extraordinariness of the Appearance at *Aberdeen*, he should have told us; for, however much many People did run after him, that Run was not equal to what it was in Places of the same, year of lesser Resort. But perhaps that which is written in the same Number from *Dundee, October 21st*, will explain it. The Words are, “ On *Wednesday Night* Mr. *Whitefield* left *Aberdeen*, where on Account of private Letters, and publick opposing of his Doctrine, great Numbers were prejudiced against him; but God was pleased to attend his Ministry with much Power, that all Opposition fell before him, and many were brought under great Convictions.” All the Explanation that this can add to what was written to Mr. *Cennick*, is but to prove it the greater Lie; for in this from *Dundee*, there are almost as many Lies as Sentences. His *Amanuensis* complains of Opposition made to his Doctrine; but was there Opposition made to any Thing but erroneous Doctrine? This is so said, as if he would have it believed that Opposition was made to right Doctrine. Did the Opposition made to his Doctrine fall before him? Is it not Fact, that he fell before it, and behoved to own that he had erred? Only pretended, if I had seen his Answer to the *Pensilvanian Queries*, I would have found, “ That he had retracted all these Things;” whereas many Things, which in his own Hearing, I laid to his Charge, were neither in the *Pensilvanian Queries*, nor in his Answers; so that he spoke falsely. And it is so far from true, that all Opposition

position fell before him, that I challenged him on the Doctrine he had preached in the College Close, from *Rom. xiv. 17.* which he could not deny; tho' I was not his Hearer. As to many brought under great Convictions, I wish it had been so; if it had been so, I had been told on the dearest Side of my Head; only let me assure you, that I can produce some seriously exercised, who went singly to hear him, who not only were disappointed, but said, tho' Mr. *Whitefield* cried vehemently on them to come to Christ, he left them in the dark about the Nature of Faith. Now if I shall judge the Truth of Mr. *Whitefield's* Progress and Success in other Places, by his Accounts of *Aberdeen*, I must look on them as a Collection of False-hoods, and on him as a Seducer going about speaking Lies in Hypocrisy.

I hope, it will not be refused, that Mr. *Whitefield* proceeds in a most irregular Way, and therefore it must be as irregular to countenance him, when he came among us, without the common Attestations of his being in Orders. He ought to carry these along with him; but since Ministers of this Church take it on his Word, he takes it very saucily, when others ask for them.

Mr. *Whitefield* is so far from choosing that Method, whereby he may in an orderly Way, be accountable for his Doctrine, Life and Conduct; that when Attempts have been made to bring him to a friendly Communion about his *American* Conduct, he declined it. It had been an easy Matter to have gratified the Gentleman at *Dean*, near *Edinburgh*, who wanted a Conference with him, and hath written some Things, that every Body thought Mr. *Whitefield's* Character was concerned in. But Mr. *Whitefield* declined this. There were such Things in that Gentleman's Letter, as if Mr. *Whitefield* in his stated Account, had in sundry Things, charged double Price, both for Services and Things bought. This bears so heavy on the Credit of his *American* Accounts, that it looked, not to say more, suspicious, and guilty like, to decline a Conference with such an *American* Acquaintance. But this *American* Ex-

pence, tho' doubly stated by Mr. *Whitefield*, seems all now to no Purpose, and a new Orphan House must be built elsewhere.

Altho' Mr. *Whitefield* pretends great Zeal against the erroneous, he caresses and compliments Persons no less erroneous. He will have "Dr. *Tillotson* to have "no more Christianity than Mahomet." I freely own, that the Thoughts of it pains me, that a Man of so great Abilities, and of such a benevolent Temper, such an Explainer of the Duties of Morality, such an Opposer of the Papists, as Dr. *Tillotson* was, should be so far wrong on the Doctrine of Grace. But shall it be said, that such a Man had no more Christianity, than Mahomet? Yea however wrong he was on the Doctrine of Justification, did he ascribe no more on that Head to Christ, than Mahomet doth? Or admit he had no more Christianity than Mahomet, then *Wesley*, *Whitefield's* Arminian or rather Pelagian Companion, must needs be in the same Class, as void of Christianity as Mahomet; but how doth Mr. *Whitefield* compliment him in his printed Letter, as his dear *Wesley*, and p. 8. as the good Man, tho' still judging him as he hath done *Tillotson*, he hath no more Christianity than Mahomet. p. 30. of his Letter to *Wesley*, "I love and honour you "for Christ's Sake; and when I come to Judgment, "will thank you before Men and Angels, for what "you have under God, done for my Soul. There I "am persuaded I shall see dear *Wesley* convinced of Ele- "ction and everlasting Love." Impossible, says *Whitefield* in the Nature of Things, that an unconverted Man can preach Christ, but he honours Mr. *Wesley* for Christ's Sake, and for the Good done to his Soul, and of whose Salvation he is persuaded, tho' according to his Judgment on Dr. *Tillotson*, he had no more Christianity than Mahomet, p. 6. of his Letter to *Wesley*, shews, that before he left *England* in 1739. he was apprised of *Wesley's* unsound Doctrine, yet whosoever reads his Journals will see, how much he commends him, "For his "Labours in the Gospel in *America*; and owns him as "his dear and fellow Labourer, and how difficult it

“ was for him to leave the *Bristol* People, did he not
 “ know that dear *Wesley* was left behind, to teach them
 “ the Way of God more perfectly : There must needs
 be some secret Reason, why Mr. *Whitefield* is sometimes
 so opposite to some erroneous Arminian Preachers,
 when he so much applauds *Wesley*, who by his own
 Censure on *Tillotson*, must needs have no more Christi-
 anity than *Mahomet*. But perhaps Mr. *Whitefield* will
 borrow from his adopted Extract, about Saints among
 all Divisions of Men, and therefore will perhaps
 put his good Man, the dear *Wesley* and Dr. *Tillotson* in
 the Class of mahometan, or heathen Saints, for you
 know the Mahometans and Heathens are a very consi-
 derable Division of Men.

Let Mr. *Whitefield* speak out, if he be not the Au-
 thor of that unsubscribed, undated Letter, in Number
 18. of his weekly History, 1741. If he be not the Au-
 thor, he should correct that History, in which Letter,
 “ He would have the Fathers and Brethren of the Non-
 “ conformity, entertaining soft Thoughts of the despi-
 “ sed *Wesley* who has maligned the Truth, who may
 “ obtain Mercy to be faithful, when many of our
 “ Head Knowledge Professors may be left to deny the
 “ Truth, because he did it ignorantly ; and I must
 “ tell you, there are among these People, despisedly
 “ called Perfectionists, I mean, the *Moravians* some
 “ clear in the Truth.”

Having observed what is sufficient upon Mr. *White-
 field*'s Carriage towards *Wesley*, the Author of that Let-
 ter brings in the despised Perfectionists, the *Moravians*.
 What is this ? Perfectionists, and yet clear in the Truth ;
 Perfectionists, and yet so dearly beloved and highly ap-
 plauded ! All the Remark that is further necessary here,
 is, to transcribe a Part of a Letter of Mr. G. Tennant's
 at *New-Brunswick*, to Mr. *Pemberton*.

“ I am very sorry for the unhappy Influence the
 “ *Moravians* have among you ; I cannot but look upon
 “ that Sect to be exceeding dangerous, and the more,
 “ because they artfully conceal their Principles. I think
 “ it my Duty to let you know some of Count *Zenzen-*

" *dorf's* Opinions communicated to some in this Place." The Revd. Mr. *Tennant* proceeds with an Account of no less than twenty strange Articles, most of them, grossly Antinomian; he might have given us more of them from his Discourses, such of them, as I have seen in Print; but among the twenty Articles, this is one. " That a converted Person cannot sin against Light, " that if they sinned, they thought what they did was " good." The Count being asked if a converted Person could sin? Said, " he could, if the Lord Jesus " left him, but that he was sure he would not."

The Revd. Mr. *Tennant* proceeds in his Letter, " Some of the foresaid Particulars, I heard the Count " assert, and the rest of them *Henrick Visser*, and some " were heard by both, at different Times, and some " by others. Two of the principal Women that accompanied the Count, asserted their Belief of Confirmation, and one of them said, since her Conversion, which she alledged was eighteen Years ago, " she neither sinned nor doubted; and the other alledged, a converted Person could not Sin."

Having mentioned Mr. *Gil. Tennant*, I see a Letter of his dated at *New-Brunswick*, December 1st 1739. to Mr. *Whitefield*, annexed to the *Pensilvanian* Queries, in which the Revd. Writer says, " I think it my Duty " to make particular Mention in Prayer of your intended Orphan House in *Georgia*; as also, of the " private Academies of our Friends in *Scotland*, *England*, &c. &c. and at my Fathers, that God would " prosper them, and incline the People to support " them." Now I would fondly know, what are these private Academies in *Scotland*, *England*, &c. &c? Or hath Mr. *Whitefield* imposed upon the Revd. Mr. *Tennant*?

Now dear Sir, to bring this extended Epistle to a Conclusion. I cannot shun thinking, that Mr. *Whitefield* hath done more to promote effectually the Cause of Episcopacy, and a liking to it in *Scotland*, than all the Means, fair or foul, that have been used since our Reformation from Popery, to this Day; and such Arguings

guings as the Apology is filled with, especially from the Pen of a professed Presbyterian, do confirm me in this Opinion. Had we need of Mr. *Whitefield* to be an Occasion of more Strife and Debate among us? Are they fewer? Yea are they not increased since he came among us? How can I hold Ministerial Fellowship with them, who act so contrary to National and Ordination Vows, as to join in Fellowship with one, who holds by the abjured Hierarchy, and is so exceptionable besides? Let any unbyassed Person tell me, if ministerial Fellowship with one who preaches, maintains, and promotes, an Indifferency about the Government of Christ's House, can consist with that Part of the Formula, "never directly or indirectly, to do any Thing to the Prejudice or Subversion of our presbyterian Church Government?" Hath it not a most direct Tendency to subvert our Presbyterian Church Government, to encourage one, who preaches up an Indifferency about it, and says, "that it was never the Intent of our Lord, that his Disciples should be one in that;" and who hath so far prevailed, that it is openly asserted by those who would be esteemed Presbyterians, "That Episcopacy and the Supremacy are no Reasons against Communion with such in the Ordinances of the Gospel."

Alas! how much is the Church of *Scotland* changed to the worse, which was once *beautiful as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem, and terrible as an Army with Banners?* Her Renown went forth among the Churches, for her Beauty, but now she hath plaid the Harlot, her Beauty is departed, her Adversaries are in the midst of her, they now break down the carved Work at once with Axes and Hammers. To complain of these Things, is looked upon as a Crime; they that would plead with their Mother, make themselves a Prey. The sad Things that now obtain among us, are causing many to *stumble at the Law, and to abhor the Offering of the Lord;* and alas! too commonly, there is offered to the Lord a corrupt Thing; Complaints upon Complaints have been made to Judicatures, because of the

Intrusion of Ministers on Christian Congregations, and because they have been denied free and unexceptionable Choices; Acts and Decisions of the national Assemblies, have been grievous to many, and as if we had not been gone far enough on in a Course of Defection, and in the great Evil of censuring some Ministers, who complained of these Things; an Indifferency about these Matters, is now preached, and greedily swallowed down.

It was more than sufficient to determine the Subversion of our ecclesiastical Government, and the Freedom of it's Exercise, distinct from the Magistracy; the *Porteous Act*, for twelve Callendar Months, read from the Pulpits of the Majority of the Ministers of this Kingdom; whereby, their Brethren, that could not in a Consistency with Presbyterian Principles, read that Act, were declared incapable to sit and vote in Church Judicatures; but now, no more Account must be made of these Things, than as of Meats and Drinks, or Matters of Indifferency.

Such Authors, who dip their Pen in too much Gall against them, who separate from Ministers and Judicatures, who have not only by publishing the foresaid Act, read an Outlawry against their Brethren; but proceed from one Evil to another, of which, the famous Apology is a Proof against the Author or Authors, or those who act according to the Doctrine thereof; I say, such Authors, tell us high Stories of the Purity of the Church of *Scotland*, in her Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government; and that we ought not to separate from a true Church.

O that there were Cause for what is pleaded this Way. The Lord God of Gods, he is Witness, that I open not my Mouth, nor employ my Pen, about these Things, from any Disaffection to the true Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*; but as one bearing Witness against her departing so foully from her own original Principles. I mean not in the least to justify any unwarrantable Separation; but till the Revd. Mr. Currie explains his Terms, *true Church and Fundamentals*, otherwise

therwise than I think he hath done, he hath done nothing, in my Opinion, to affect the Cause the seceding Ministers are engaged in; I wish they marr it not themselves, by some new Run into Extremes.

If by *true Church*, Mr. Currie means a Church holding and standing fast in the Truth, let him prove the Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*--Judicially to be doing that; and far shall it be from my Heart to envy the present established Church, its being called a true Church; or to think, or say, that as such, there should be any Separation from it: But if by true Church, be understood any Society, that we will own to be really a Church of Christ, he goes too far when he says, that we are not to separate from any true Church, for this condemns a Separation from the Church of *England*, which the Dissenters will own, to be a true Church, in that Sense; that it is really a Church of Christ.

I wish the Revd. *Father* had been more determined in explaining that Term, *Fundamentals*; for if thereby, be only understood such Things as are fundamental to our common Hope, if we are not to separate from them who are right in these, then we are not to make it a Reason of Separation, the being wrong upon the Heads of Worship and Government. This would carry the Matter further than the Apologist goes, who, tho' he makes not Episcopacy and Supremacy, a Reason for this, he bogles, if there be Corruption in Worship; and I believe, so would the worthy Mr. Currie do, whatever be the native Effect of his Argument.

If by *Fundamentals*, be understood such Things as are fundamental to Doctrine, Worship and Government, Mr. Currie, must first prove, the Church of *Scotland*, in her Judicatures, and judicial Proceedings, to be preserving sound and intire, her fundamental Principles of Government, and to be acting accordingly; and when he doth that, I promise him, I shall condemn Separation as fast as he doth: But since Government is a Bond of Union, as well as Doctrine and

Worship ; I must be excused to separate from them that break that Bond of Union, or rather must be allowed, to call them the Separatists, who do break it. I wish these Points had been a little more laboured, it had been in my Opinion, nearer the Purpose for, or against Separation, in the present State of Things, than Arguments taken from old Practice in this Church ; about which we are not so clearly informed, which hath brought forth enough to irritate, and to put Brethren more asunder, but nothing to clear the Debate. Such a Thing is a Lie, and such a Thing is a Falsehood, are not gaining Arguments.

But what need I speak of Government, since the great Cry and Plea now runs upon Union, and Communion in Ordinances with all those, who are right in the Essentials of Salvation. So far as this Plea concerns the hearing of an Episcopalian, I have considered it already : So far as it affects Union and Communion with Ministers, and Church Judicatures, in *Scotland* ; I know it will be pleaded, that our Standards of Doctrine are preserved pure, but are they not so in the Church of *England* also ? Their Articles are not changed more than our Confession of Faith ; but will we say, that the Church of *England* is not for all that corrupt in her Doctrine, tho' her Articles are not changed ? I wish there were more Ground than there is, for pleading the Church of *Scotland*'s Purity in Doctrine ; for what doth it that we have an orthodox Standard, and Ministers and Preachers subscribe to it, when so much unsound Doctrine is preached and printed by the Subscribers ? There have of late Years been sore Thrusts at sundry precious Truths, tho' these Things have come under the Animadversion of Judicatures, the Erroneous have been stroked with such a slight Censure, that others have taken greater Liberty in preaching Error, and such as would complain, have been discouraged from it, when they saw the bad Effects of Essays of that Kind.

I can with great Sincerity say, that it is a Necessity laid upon me, when by Word or Write, I complain of the spreading of unsound Doctrine among us ; but the

Propo-

Propagators are now become barefaced, as seeing, that they can proceed without Censure or Controul, of which many particular Proofs and Instances might be given.

But to put the Matter beyond all Doubt, after the present Principal *Wishart* in the College of *Edinburgh*, is slightly acquitted of a Process relative to his Doctrine, he begins to his former Work, in broaching and recommending, what is erroneous ; as he did that Book, intituled, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man, Anno 1739.* recommending it to Students, Preachers and private Christians to form upon. Whatever were the great Qualities of Dr. *Scougal*, its Author ; they are ignorant of the Doctrine of our Confession of Faith, who see not an Opposition between it and Dr. *Scougal's* Doctrine. There is not any Person versed in the Arminian Doctrine, but justly claim that Book, as on their Side ; and so Dr. *Burnet*, who first recommended it, did understand it, when he tells us, " That the Author consented to its going abroad, if what is printed with it, " directed to noble *Eusebes*, should be published also." Altho' the Author of that Book, in a very devout Stile offers many good Things, yet are they so preposterously laid, or such Weight and Efficacy, is laid upon them ; as to spoil the Orthodoxy of the Scheme. For Proof of this, let us but take Notice, how, according to him, we become Partakers of the Divine Nature : " We " must shun all manner of Sin : We must know what " Things are sinful : We must resist Temptations to " Sin, by considering the Evils they will draw on us : " We must keep a constant Watch over our selves : " We must often examine our Actions : It is fit we restrain our selves in many lawful Things : We must " strive to put our selves out of Love with the World : " We must do these outward Actions that are commanded : We must endeavour to form internal Acts " of Devotion, Charity, &c. Thus should we exercise our selves to Godliness." By which it seems the Doctor would have us exercised to Godliness, before we be godly ; he would have us exercised to Godliness before we be made Partakers of the divine Nature. Let us

hear what he says, p. 84. of Dr. *Wishart's* Impression,
 " Thus should we exercise our selves unto Godliness,
 " and when we are employing the Powers that we have,
 " the Spirit of God is wont to strike in, and elevate
 " these Acts of our Soul, beyond the Pitch of Nature."
N. B. No Word here of changing the Nature, but on-
 ly, " of elevating these Acts of the Soul beyond the
 " Pitch of Nature, and giving them a divine Impressi-
 " on ; and after the frequent Reiteration of these, we
 " shall find ourselves more inclined unto them, they
 " flowing with greater Freedom and Ease."

The being exercised to Godliness, before we be Par-
 takers of the divine Nature, or in order to the Partici-
 pation of it, is quite other Doctrine, than what we
 read in our excellent Confession, Chap. 9. Sect. 3.
 " Man by his Fall into a State of Sin, hath wholly lost
 " all Ability of Will, to any spiritual Good accompa-
 " nying Salvation ; so as a natural Man being altoge-
 " ther averse from that Good, and dead in Sin, is not
 " able in his own Strength, to convert himself, or to
 " prepare himself thereunto."

Tho' it is far from us, to forbid or deny the Use of
 means, we dare not lay on them that Efficay, which
 Dr. *Scougal* doth ; nor dare we look on an unregenerate
 Man, using means, as exercised to Godliness. This is
 not the Doctrine of our excellent Confession, Chap.
 16. Sect. 7. " Works done by unregenerate men, al-
 " tho' for the Matter of them, they may be Things
 " which God commands, and of good Use both to
 " themselves and others. Yet, because they proceed
 " not from an Heart purified by Faith, nor are done
 " in a right Manner, according to the Word, nor to a
 " right End, the Glory of God ; they are therefore
 " sinful, and cannot please God, or make a Man meet
 " to receive Grace from God. And yet their Neg-
 " lect of them is more sinful and displeasing unto God.
 This is quite other Doctrine, " than the elevating our
 " Acts beyond the Pitch of Nature, giving our Acts a
 " divine Impression, that after the frequent Reiterati-

" on of them, we may find ourselves more inclined to
 " them, they flowing with greater Freedom and Ease.

But I need not stay to remark on this Book of Dr.
Scougal's recommended by Dr. *Wishart*, my Opinion
 of the Nature and Tenor of its Doctrine, is justified by
 Dr. *Wishart* himself, in his Address to young Ministers,
 Preachers of the Gospel, and Students of Divinity, pre-
 fixed to his late Impression of Dr. *Whichcot's* Sermons,
 p. 13. " If one has read with Attention and Serious-
 " ness, the last Book I took upon me, to revive among
 " us, *Scougal's Life of God in the Soul of Man*, (a Book
 " that seems to be calculated to all Capacities,) he may
 " be pretty well prepared to read these Sermons with
 " Satisfaction and Benefit. p. 4. and 5. of this Ad-
 " dress, Dr. *Wishart* says, To you who are Students in
 " Divinity, the Station, I have now the Honour to be
 " in, both entitles me, and makes it my Duty, to give
 " my best Advice.----- I do apprehend, you might still
 " reap further Benefit by a close Study of these Sermons ;
 " which I would recommend to you as a Mine, out of which
 " you may dig, and a Model by which you may im-
 " prove. ----- I here put into your Hands a Piece of
 " rich Ore, in which you will find the best Materials
 " for the Furniture of your publick Performances. You
 " have here a rich Collection of the noblest Sentiments,
 " upon the Evidences of vital and practical Religion,
 " and the Considerations that are of the greatest
 " Strength to recommend it to the Heart of Man, and
 " apply it the Conduct of Life."

Dr. *Wishart* p. 7. says, " I do not mean to take
 " upon me to defend every Sentiment dropt in these
 " Discourses ; far less every Manner of Expression as
 " the most accurate." But I think this but a poor Sal-
 vo for his opening and inviting Students and Preachers,
 to labour in such a Mine of Error and *Heterodoxy*, after
 what he hath said immediately before in the same Page.
 " Here you have a rich Treasure of Materials both for
 " the Improvement of your Minds and Hearts, and
 " for more publick Use. I thought once to have illu-
 " strated this by some particular Detail ; but found

“ that was likely to lead me to transcribe almost every
 “ Sentiment in the Book.” Dr. *Wishart* might have
 given us *Whichcot*’s Character also, from Bishop *Burnet*
 in the History of his own Time, p. 306. of the
 Octavo Impression. “ *Whichcot* was a Man of a rare
 “ Temper, very mild and obliging. ----- He was much
 “ for Liberty of Conscience, and being disgusted with
 “ the dry systematical Way of those Times, he studied
 “ to raise those who conversed with him to a nobler
 “ Set of Thoughts, and to consider Religion, as a Seed
 “ of a deiform Nature. In Order to this he set young
 “ Students much on reading the antient Philosophers,
 “ chiefly *Plato*, *Tully* and *Plotin*, and on considering
 “ the christian Religion as a Doctrine sent from God,
 “ both to elevate and sweeten human Nature, in which
 “ he was a great Example, as well as a wise and kind
 “ Instructor.” The Bishop, p. 309, speaking of
Whichcot and other Divines, then at Cambridge, says,
 “ They read *Episcopius* much. And the making out
 “ of the Reasons of Things, being a main Part of their
 “ Studies, their Enemies called them Socinians.”

I should think those to have been very ill disposed
 Persons who would have been Enemies to so sweet
 blooded a Man as Dr. *Whichcot*; but if his Doctrine,
 favours more of Socinianism than any Thing else, it
 will not argue Enmity to give every Thing its own
 Name, and Dr. *Wishart* will be found to have opened
 up again a poisonous Mine, the Stems of which, have
 killed many who have digged in it.

What must the State of the Church of *Scotland* be
 when such Sermons are recommended by the Head of
 a College, for Students and Preachers to form upon?
 It were well worth the ablest Pen to be employed on
 this Subject, and to discover the vast Collection of *Er-*
ror and *Heterodoxy*, with which these Sermons are stuffed.
 If I believe according to the Doctrine of these Sermons,
 common Honesty, would oblige me to give up with our
 Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

I shall lay before you some of the strange Doctrines
 contained these Sermons, by which any Person but tol-
 lerably

lerably instructed, may see his erroneous Notions concerning the Depravity of our Natures, the Method of Recovery, the Necessity of a Satisfaction to divine Justice; the Belief of the Trinity, and Deity of Christ; the Doctrine of original Sin, and Justification through Faith in Christ, as the Lord our Righteousness; the Ordinances and Institutions of Jesus Christ. All which are thrust at one Way or another, by the Doctrine of these Sermons; which I might shew at large, if it were not Time to draw to a Close of this Epistle. I have not Time to range the erroneous Doctrine of the Sermons, under particular Heads; I shall therefore only present you but with a few, of the many exceptionable and condemnable Points of Doctrine, according to the Order of the Sermons, and if the Ministers and Judicatures of the Church of *Scotland*, will justify and palliate these Things; or under all their present Pretensions to a reviving of the Lord's Work among them, shall be silent Spectators of this notorious Wrong done to Truth, I behooved to warn every Man, to come out from among them, and to be separate. But to proceed with a few of many Points, that might be taken from Dr. *Whitchot's* so much recommended Sermons. p. 7. "Remission of Sins to them that repent and deprecate God's Displeasure, is the most credible Thing in the World.

P. 11, 12. "Now the Terms of the new Covenant are possible to Sinners, &c. for if I have offended against the Rule of Right, I ought to repent of it, confess it, and be sorry for it; and do my Endeavour to commit it no more, and there is Reason to think that God can pardon, for every's One's Right is in his own Power; &c. Since therefore it is God's Right upon the Failure of Obedience, to reduce the Creature by Punishment, it is in his Power to abate of Punishment, if he pleases."

P. 12. "Therefore we conclude that all the Instances of christian Doctrine, either they are fairly knowable, if we use our Faculties and Understanding; and these are the Instances of Morality, and
Princi-

“ Principles of Reason ; or else, if we do consider these
 “ Things that are considerable in the Case, the Things
 “ of revealed Truth are of fair and easy Belief.”

P. 13. “ As to Morals, we have the full Concurrence
 “ with us of Heathen Authors, all those that are any
 “ Whit reformed ; and as to revealed Truths, the se-
 “ veral Parts of History concur in all Things that the
 “ Evangelists, declare concerning Christ. ----- No Man
 “ of any Competency of Knowledge, or Proportion of
 “ Goodness, hath risen up against any of the great In-
 “ stances of Morality, or Articles of the Christian
 “ Faith.”

P. 14. “ It is observable, that the great Differences
 “ that have been between Men in the several Ages of
 “ the World, they have not been about any necessary,
 “ and indispensable Truth, nor any Thing that is de-
 “ clared plainly in any Text of Scripture. But all the
 “ Differences have been either in Points of every curious
 “ and nice Speculation, or in arbitrary Modes of
 “ Worship.”

P. 20. “ The Grace of the Gospel, whereby we
 “ hope to be saved, doth not only give Countenance,
 “ Help, real Furtherance and Assistance to natural
 “ Truth, which lost much by Man's Apostacy from
 “ God, and so needed a Hand to help it up ; but
 “ it also doth it's own proper Work, by emptying the
 “ Mind of Man of Wilfulness, Presumption, and self-
 “ Conceit, which is incident to his Nature, and so
 “ making Room for the Help of Grace, and divine
 “ Assistance and Forgiveness.”

After the Author had spoken of the divine Spirit to
 guide and teach Men, he adds, p. 29. “ Tho' for my
 “ Part, I do believe that the Scripture is clear and full
 “ of Light as to all Matters of Conscience, as to all
 “ Rules of Life, as to all necessary Matters of Faith,
 “ so that any well minded Man that takes up the Bible,
 “ and reads, may come to Understanding and Satisfac-
 “ tion.”

P. 35. “ The Matter of the Gospel, is a vital Prin-
 ciple satisfying the Reason of our Mind, and setting us at
 Rest

" rest within ourselves, as thereby seeing and know-
 " ing that we are out of Danger. What more quiet-
 " ing to Conscience than to be assured, that God to
 " whom we are so obnoxious by Sin, is placable and
 " reconcilable of himself, through the Perfection of
 " his own Nature, and that he is absolutely resolved
 " and engaged by his own Determination and Pro-
 " mise, to pardon Sin, in and thorough Christ, to all
 " who repent, and believe the Gospel. This is to be
 " accepted in and through Christ, and is the real Ex-
 " plication of Justification by imputed Righteousness."

P. 43. " That which Religion requires, is to find
 " out the Reason of Things and to comply with it;
 " to move according to the Dictates of Reason, and
 " to observe the Order of the End, to avoid such
 " Things as will do us harm, to live according to the
 " Difference of Good and Evil, to do the one and a-
 " void the other; which are not positive and arbitrary
 " Impositions, but they arise from Conveniencies and
 " Inconveniencies of our Natures, States and Rela-
 " tions."

P. 63. 64. " Here you may have an Account what
 " it is that gives a Check and a Stop to the Motion
 " of the divine Spirit; there is an Error in the first
 " Concoction, which is hardly remedied, which is
 " the Want of Advertency, and Consideration; Men
 " do not awaken their Principles, but give them-
 " selves Leave to do what they cannot justify them-
 " selves in. Now there is no Place for the further
 " Motion of the divine Grace, where the former Grace
 " is neglected, and rendered ineffectual."

P. 66. " It is an Apology for a finite fallible Crea-
 " ture when he is mistaken, when he had some Rea-
 " son for his Mistake, and if he can but shew why
 " he did so think, you have him excused."

P. 79. " It is not to glorify God to think that he
 " hath imposed a Law upon himself, or any Way
 " limited or disabled himself, to commiserate in all
 " compassionate Cases.

P. 80. " A hundred to one, but the Excellency of those Men's Divinity, is Sovereignty, to ruin a great Part of the Creation to shew his Power."

P. 102. " It is not so much the Disability of Men's Natures, as their Neglect and Abuse that Men are not good."

P. 103. " Nature is sovereign to them that use it well, in Respect of that Modesty and Averseness, to that which is not fair and handsome; till Men pervert and abuse Nature's Temper by ill Use, Custom, and Practice; Goodness and Virtue, are more suitable to Nature's Sense, than Wickedness and Vice."

P. 186. " No Man's Mind is changed or bettered but by his own particular Consideration; if therefore you will bring yourselves to this Temper, to do the Things that are lovely: In the first Place consider what God is, and what his Actings and Dealings with his Creatures are, and if we propose to ourselves what God doth in the World, and how he carrieth it in his Family, this Consideration will promote in us this Disposition and Temper."

P. 190. " Wherefore it argues Carelessness and neglective Indifferency, to be unresolved, undetermined in Matters of any Weight in Religion, for we may fetch most of it out of our selves, *Acts* xvii. 27. Awaken intellectual Faculties, search, consider, examine Principles of God's Creation. All but what is properly revealed Truth may be found out, all Offices of Piety, Devotion towards God, all Acts of Righteousness, all Ways of Moderation, Kindness, Benevolence towards Fellow Creatures, Subordination of Sense to Reason within thy self."

Passing a great many Passages that might be noticed I proceed to p. 205. " It is a Thing worthy of God, God's Prerogative to pardon, (if it be lawful to put these Thing in Comparison) is rather more, than there is Power and Right to punish. If God pu-

"nish Sin he doth that which is just. But nevertheless God is not by any Attribute of his under a Necessity to punish Sin; if the Sinner repent, deprecate his just Offence and Displeasure, and return to his Duty. God doth that which is just, if he punish Sin; but then I dare not say, that it is just that God should punish, or that he were unjust if he did not do it.

P. 208. "If the Sinner leave off to Sin, and condemn himself, the Necessity of Punishment is taken away."

P. 212. "Repentance is that which makes a finite Being failing, capable of Compassion, if Repentance did not take Effect, it would be too hazardous for a Creature to come into Being, if upon a Lapse, an Error or Mistake we should be undone to Eternity, without all Hope of Recovery, who would willingly enter on this State?"

P. 213. "Pardon it self is the Act of God, and depends on the use of his Power, God hath Power over his own Right, and may abate of it what he pleaseth."

P. 215. "Reason and Argument are transforming Principles in intellectual Natures, and it is not possible where Men are informed and satisfied with good Reason and Argument, but it should work upon them."

Preaching on Acts xiii 23. *Of this Man's Seed hath God according to his Promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus*, he saith, p. 218. 219. "You see that all these great Things which concern the Messias, and are matter of our Faith, you have them all in these Words; but in other Institutions of God, you have either all or most of the Circumstances left out, and many Things left to christian Prudence, Liberty and good Affection."

"In the Lords Supper, we have only in the Institution, the Action and the Explication of the Action, but in what Company? What Preparation? At what Time? How often? In what Posture? All

“ these are left undetermined, and there is no Appoint-
 “ ment of God in these Matters.”

P. 222. There is no Superstition in using Things
 “ not commanded by God, even in the Worship of
 “ God, if they be comely and such as Reason doth
 “ allow.”

P, 223. “ In Matters of Weight wherein the Ho-
 “ nour of God, and the Safety of Men’s Souls are con-
 “ cerned, Scripture is punctual, clear, full and par-
 “ ticular: But as to other Matter they are left to chri-
 “ stian Prudence, Discretion and Fidelity.”

Ibid: “ For it is hazardous to a Man in minute
 “ Things to be obliged in Point of Conscience. If the
 “ Thing be good in itself, I am admonished daily how
 “ to act by the Rectitude of my Temper, because the
 “ Thing is good in its own Nature and Quality; but
 “ in the other Case, I have nothing but the Security
 “ of my Memory.”

P. 295. “ If we find not rest and greater Satisfac-
 “ tion in God, than in all worldly Pleasure and De-
 “ light, it is because we have not exerted our highest
 “ and noblest Faculties in that Vigor which we ought,
 “ ----- but have suffered noble Faculties to be inter-
 “ rupted by bodily Indisposition or worldly Pleasure,
 “ whereby they become untoward to Things spiritual.”

I have made no Remarks on Dr. *Whichcot*’s Doc-
 trine; I hope there is as much of a *Spirit of a sound*
Mind remaining in *Scotland*, as to see, at first View,
 the Unsoundness of it. Tho’ it is surprizing to me,
 that the Ministers and Judicatures make no Animad-
 version thereupon, especially, as these select Sermons
 are recommended by Dr. *Wishart* the Head of a Col-
 lege, as fit for young Ministers, Preachers, Students
 of Divinity, and private Christians; and at a Time,
 when some Ministers are publishing to the World, Ac-
 counts of uncommon Appearances of God’s owning the
 Church of *Scotland* in her Ministrations in an extraor-
 dinary Way. It might be expected that such Pastors
 and People who would have it believed, that the Lord
 is returning in a remarkable Manner, to a backsliding
 and

and degenerated Church, would have shown some Concern for discouraging and censuring such barefaced Attempts at corrupting the Christian System. It appears too evident, that if the Seceders, or any who take Part with them, in bearing Witness against Corruptions in *Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government*, be, by one Mean or another, weakened or discouraged, the Church of Scotland shall be esteemed as highly favoured, and in a happy and flourishing Condition, when yet gross Errors and Delusions are countenanced, and recommended by Pastors and People.

I insist no longer on these Things, nor can I now enter upon the other Part of your Demand. When I began this Letter, I was not thinking of writing so fully, or of sending you an Answer in such a publick Manner. If I had seen the *Apology* sooner which only came to my Hand on the ninth of September, you might have had this Return sooner, which is now published, and written, I think with such Impartiality, that they will be unjust to me, who shall alledge, that I am for covering or justifying the Faults, even of those to whom I am most affected. My preaching in such an impartial Way, hath made an injurious Neighbour run about, asking People, what Principle I am of, as if I were neither *Episcopal*, nor *Presbyterian*, *Independent* nor *Anabaptist*, *Seceder*, nor *Acceder*; But I dare say, tho' you had never known me before, if you will give any Credit to what I have written; you would conclude I am a Presbyterian, strictly maintaining our *Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Presbyterian Government*, to be according to, and warranted by the Word of God; and that as such, I am bound by that divine Warrant and Authority, to adhere to the same, and that I am one who owns the superadded Tyes and Obligations I am under by the *national Covenant, solemn League and Covenant, and Ordination Vows and Engagements*, to maintain the said *Presbyterian Church Government, Doctrine and Worship*, and to endeavour the *Extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, Superstition*,

tion, Heresy, Schism, Profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound Doctrine, and the Power of Godliness; and not to make Defection to the contrary Part, or to give up my self to a detestable Indifference, or Neutrality in this Cause, and never to do any Thing prejudicial to, or subversive of the said Presbyterian Church Government, Doctrine, Worship and Discipline: Schism in, and Separation from a Church holding fast these her own original Principles, I abhor and disclaim, I wish it could be so said, of all the Ministers, Elders, Deacons, Judicatures and People in Scotland, who at the Time they are professing themselves to be Presbyterian, are so very unlike it, in some notour Practices, and now so openly declared Principles.

I pray the Lord may pity and forgive such Ministers and People, who instead of looking narrowly in to the low Estate of the Church of Scotland, are deeming them no less than guilty of the Sin against the Holy Ghost, who would guard People against every Person and Engine, that tends to bring in Error, Confusion and Delusion. Permit me dear Sir, to borrow the Apostle's Words, 2 Cor. xiii. 6. 7. 8. *But I trust that ye shall know, that we are not Reprobates ----- Now I pray to God, that ye do no Evil, not that we should appear approved, but that ye should do that which is honest, tho' we be as Reprobates. ----- For we can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.* O that the Lord would clear the Judgments of all that may be deceived, or mistaken, that we may all call upon the Name of the Lord, and serve him with one Consent. Zeph. iii. 9. *That the Lord would give us one Heart, and one Way, that he would arise and have Mercy on the Church of Scotland, in which he hath had his dwelling in Time past, that the Messenger of the Covenant would come into his Temple, and cleanse his own House, and thrust out the Buyers and Sellers, that he would purify the Sons of Levi, that they may offer unto the Lord an Offering in Righteousness.* That the
Ordi-

Ordinances in *Scotland* may be pure and intire, powerful and successful, and pleasant unto the Lord, as in the Days of old, as in former Times; and that the Lord would preserve from a Spirit of Error, and strong Delusions, because we have not received the Love of the Truth: That he would raise up many, who may understand the Times and what the Israel of God should do, is the sincere and hearty Prayer of,

S I R,

Yours in all dutiful Respects,

JOHN BISSET.

*Aberdeen, October,
26th 1742.*

Minister of the GOSPEL
in *Aberdeen.*

POSTSCRIPT.

S I N C E writing the above, I have seen a Letter of Mr. *Whitefield's* addressed to the Revd. Mr. *Willison* of *Dundee*, giving his Sentiments about the Oath of Supremacy, a catholick Spirit, &c, dated at *Camuslang*, August 17th, 1742. wherein he says, "As to the Supremacy; My Sentiments as to the Authority and Power of the civil Magistrate, as to sacred Things, agree

“ agree with what is said in the *Westminster* Confession
 “ of Faith, Chap. xxiii. Par. 3^d, and 4th, I do own
 “ the Lord Jesus to be the blessed Head and King of
 “ his Church.” I could shew at Length from the ec-
 clesiastical Law of *England*, that they own that the
 Church hath a divine Right of Government, but the
 Exercise of this Right in *Foro Exteriori*, in established
 Courts, depends on the Magistrate. They that would
 be satisfied in this Matter, may read *Gray* the Rector of
Hinton’s Abridgement of the ecclesiastical Law of *Eng-
 land*. The *English* Clergy at the same Time, they swear
 the Supremacy, will assert in as strong Terms, as Mr.
Whitefield doth, “ That the Lord Jesus is the blessed
 “ Head and King of his Church.” And with the Salvo
 of their Distinction, of a divine Right of Government in
 the Church, from Jesus Christ, and a Right in *Foro Ex-
 teriori*, derived from the Magistrate, they would make
 no Scruple to subscribe these Articles of the *Westminster*
 Confession, referred to, and acknowledged by Mr.
Whitefield. But if Mr. *Whitefield* would have renounced
 the Supremacy in the Sense it is owned by the Church
 of *England*, and denied by the *Westminster* Confession,
 he should for that End have hit on right Articles of that
 Confession, as Chap. 30th, Sect. 1st, “ The Lord Je-
 “ sus as King and Head of his Church, hath therein
 “ appointed a Government in the Hand of Church
 “ Officers, distinct from the civil Magistrate. Chap.
 “ xxv. Sect. 6. There is no other Head of the Church
 “ but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of
 “ *Rome* in any Sense be Head thereof, but is that An-
 “ ti-Christ, that Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition,
 “ that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ,
 “ and all that is called God.”

Mr. *Whitefield* says, “ he is far from being against
 “ Church Government, for how can any Church subsist
 “ without it ?” But what is this to the Purpose of re-
 tracting his Errors on the Head of Government, unless
 he had declared his Belief, that the Lord Jesus as King
 and Head of his Church, hath established such a Go-
 vernment in his House, which the Church ought strict-

y to maintain, and not to come and go upon, as a matter of Indifferency, and ought to maintain as a Bond of Union amongst themselves.

But says Mr. *Whitefield*, "That since holy Men may differ about the outward Form, I would bear with, and converse freely with all others, who do not err in Fundamentals, and who give Evidence, that they are true Lovers of the Lord Jesus." Mr. *Whitefield* hath said nothing here at all for justifying his Practice in outward Church Communion with all that err not in Fundamentals, which is by far a higher Matter of Importance, than the hearing and conversing with them, What he says, is a mere Evasion.

He adds, "This is what I mean by a catholick Spirit, not that I believe a *Jew* or *Pagan*, continuing such, can be a true Christian, or can have true Christianity in them, and if there be any Thing tending that Way in the late Extract, which I sent you, I utterly disavow it, and I am sure, I observed no such Thing in it, when I published it; tho' upon a closer Review, some Expressions seem justly exceptionable."

It seems whatever have been. the mistaken Respects of my Revd. and very worthy Father Mr. *Willison*, to Mr. *Whitefield*, he and I have had the same Notion of Mr. *Whitefield's* Extract. The Question is not what Mr. *Whitefield* took to be the meaning of that Extract, but what is the real obvious meaning of it? It is not his general Acknowledgement of some Expressions exceptionable in it, when quarrelled thereupon, that will ballance his hearty embracing, and warm Recommendation of it. But this is Mr. *Whitefield's* Way, either designedly or rashly, to get his erroneous Trash once propagated, and disseminated, and when he cannot hold these Things, when fairly found Fault with, he gives us a slight Acknowledgement, O he did not mean so, he did not see such Errors, if he had seen them, he would have disavowed them; but we find him not at the same Pains to propagate his Retractions, as he is at to disseminate his Errors. He makes slight Acknowledgements to some particular Friends, but what say these Things to the curing of the People.

People, whom he poisons with his Errors? I shall only on this Part of his Letter, add a few Sentences from the Publisher of Mr. *Caldwel's* Sermon. "He (Mr. *Whitefield*) has made a Sort of Recantation, and affects a wonderful Ignorance of what was contained in the Extract recommended by him, as containing the Sentiments of his Heart. The Book is, Mr. *Law's Appeal to Infidels*, &c. and he says, he has read it. If so, it is hardly possible his Recantation can be sincere; there is not perhaps, one of a tolerable Understanding in the Nation, who, after having read the whole, would have taken the Extract in the Sense, he pretends to take it, in his sham Recantation.

The Readers of this Letter of Mr. *Whitefield's* will notice how careful he is to distinguish in his Respects to the *Westminster* Confession, asserting "his Belief of all the Doctrines of Grace there held forth." But he passes over the other Articles, he is not minded to acknowledge his Belief of them. If the Revd. Mr. *Willison* be pleased with this Letter, against which, I might have enlarged my Exceptions; he is become easier to please, than he hath been sometime of his Ministry; wherein he hath been long a worthy Labourer.

The Publisher of Mr. *Caldwel's* Sermon, lets me see what I am to expect for my Opposition to Mr. *Whitefield*. "We have had Letters printed in the *Boston Gazette*, representing the Church of *Scotland*, (except a few that are Admirers of Mr. *Whitefield*), as remaining dead and formal, as before, and without Success." I have the justest Cause to complain of Deadness and Unsuccessfulness; but I humbly think, that my Opposition to this strolling Impostor, whose Cheats in due Time, I hope, will be discovered, is no Evidence of it.

F I N I S.